

Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe (1770-1945)

Texts and Commentaries



Volume Two: National Romanticism – The Formation of National Movements



Edited by Balázs Trencsényi and Michal Kopeček

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

**DISCOURSES OF COLLECTIVE
IDENTITY IN CENTRAL
AND SOUTHEAST EUROPE
(1770–1945)**

TEXTS AND COMMENTARIES

VOLUME II

**NATIONAL ROMANTICISM
—
THE FORMATION OF NATIONAL MOVEMENTS**

**DISCOURSES OF COLLECTIVE
IDENTITY IN CENTRAL
AND SOUTHEAST EUROPE
(1770–1945)**

TEXTS AND COMMENTARIES

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

AHMET ERSOY, MACIEJ GÓRNY, VANGELIS KECHRIOTIS,
MICHAL KOPEČEK, BOYAN MANCHEV,
BALÁZS TRENCSENYI, MARIUS TURDA



**DISCOURSES OF COLLECTIVE
IDENTITY IN CENTRAL
AND SOUTHEAST EUROPE
(1770–1945)**

TEXTS AND COMMENTARIES

VOLUME II

NATIONAL ROMANTICISM

—
**THE FORMATION
OF NATIONAL MOVEMENTS**

Edited by
Balázs Trencsényi and Michal Kopeček



CENTRAL EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY PRESS
Budapest • New York

©2007 by Ahmet Ersoy, Maciej Górny, Vangelis Kechriotis, Michal Kopeček, Boyan
Manchev, Balázs Trencsényi, Marius Turda

Published in 2007 by

Central European University Press
An imprint of the
Central European University Share Company
Nádor utca 11, H-1051 Budapest, Hungary
Tel: +36-1-327-3138 or 327-3000
Fax: +36-1-327-3183
E-mail: ceupress@ceu.hu
Website: www.ceupress.com

400 West 59th Street, New York NY 10019, USA
Tel: +1-212-547-6932
Fax: +1-646-557-2416
E-mail: mgreenwald@sorosny.org

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted,
in any form or by any means, without the permission
of the Publisher.

ISBN 963 7326 60 X cloth
978-963-7326-60-8
Series ISBN 963 7326 51 0

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Discourses of collective identity in Central and Southeast Europe (1770–1945) : texts and commentaries /
edited by Balázs Trencsényi and Michal Kopeček.
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN-10: 9637326529 (v. 1)

ISBN-13: 978-9637326523 (v. 1)

1. Europe, Eastern–History–Sources. 2. Nationalism–Europe, Eastern–History–Sources. 3. Ethnicity–
Europe, Eastern–History–Sources. I. Trencsényi, Balázs, 1973– II. Kopeček, Michal. III. Title.

DJK3.D577 2006
943.0009'034--dc22

2006000224

Printed in Hungary by
Akadémiai Nyomda, Martonvásár

NATIONAL ROMANTICISM
—
THE FORMATION
OF NATIONAL MOVEMENTS

Contributors

Ildiko Erdei, Ahmet Ersoy, Maciej Górny, Rigels Halili, Miroslav Hroch, Nikola Iordanovski, Vangelis Kechriotis, Michal Kopeček, Pavol Lukáč, Boyan Manchev, Teodora Shek Brnardić, Balázs Trencsényi, Marius Turda

Consultants

Bojan Aleksov, Sorin Antohi, Zrinka Blažević, Guido Franzinetti, Miroslav Hroch, Maciej Janowski, Jeremy King, Paschalis Kitromilides, Pavel Kolář, László Kontler, Antonis Liakos, Elena Mannová, István Margócsy, Diana Mishkova, Robert Pynsent, Anatol Schmied-Kowarzik, Dušan Škvarna, Funda Soysal

Translations by

Alena Alexandrova (from Bulgarian), Elena Alexieva (from Bulgarian), Krištof Bodrič (from Serbian), Vedran Dronjić (from Serbian), Ahmet Ersoy (from Ottoman Turkish), Rigels Halili (from Albanian), Nikola Iordanovski (from Macedonian), Kevin Ireland (from Bulgarian), Rudyard Kipling (from Greek), Mary Kitroeff (from Greek and French), Hans Kohn (from Czech), Mária Kovács (from Romanian), Zuzanna Ładyga (from Polish), Pavol Lukáč (from German), Kenneth R. Mackenzie (from Polish), Gordon MacLean (from Slovak), Adam Makkai (from Hungarian), Vasa D. Mihailovich (from Serbian), Dávid Oláh (from Hungarian), Derek Paton (from Czech), Iva Polak (from Croatian), Dorothea Prall Radin (from Polish), Robert Pynsent (from Czech), Hugh Roberts (from French), Petr Roubal (from Slovak), Robert Russell (from German), Paul Selver (from Czech), George Szirtes (from Hungarian), Louise Varèse (from Polish)

Copy-editor

Frank Schaer

Table of Contents

Introduction

The 'Identity Reader' Project	1
Miroslav Hroch: <i>National Romanticism</i>	4

Chapter I.

Historicizing the Nation: Images of the Past, Continuity into the Present

Dániel Berzsenyi: <i>To the Hungarians</i>	21
Joseph von Hormayr: <i>Austria and Germany</i>	27
Joachim Lelewel: <i>Legitimacy of the Polish nation</i>	33
Mihail Kogălniceanu: <i>Speech for the opening of the course on national history</i>	42
František Palacký: <i>A History of the Czech nation in Bohemia and Moravia</i>	50
Mihály Horváth: <i>History of the Hungarian war of independence of 1848-1849</i>	57
Jakub Malý: <i>Our national rebirth</i>	65
Constantinos Paparrigopoulos: <i>History of the Hellenic nation</i>	72
Jovan Jovanović Zmaj: <i>Bright graves, Grandfather and grandson</i>	81
Ivan Vazov: <i>Under the yoke</i>	87
Namık Kemal: <i>Ottoman history</i>	94

Chapter II.

Spirit of the Nation: Customs, Language, Religion

Josef Jungmann: <i>Second conversation concerning the Czech language</i>	103
Vuk Stefanović Karadžić: <i>Little Slavo-Serbian song book of the common people</i>	112
Ferenc Kölcsey: <i>National traditions, Hymn</i>	117
Maurycy Mochnacki: <i>Thoughts on how the translation of foreign belles-lettres influences Polish literature</i>	126
Charles Sealsfield: <i>Austria as it is</i>	132
Dimitrios Vyzantios: <i>Babel, or the local distortion of the Greek language</i>	138
Henryk Rzewuski: <i>Moral varieties</i>	143
Ľudovít Štúr: <i>The Slovak dialect, or the necessity of writing in this dialect</i>	148
Jevrem Grujić and Milovan Janković: <i>South Slavs, or the Serbian nation with the Croats and the Bulgarians</i>	154

Simion Bărnuțiu: <i>The public law of the Romanians</i>	160
Dora D'Istria: <i>The Albanian nationality on the basis of popular songs</i>	168
Osman Hamdi Bey and Victor Marie de Launay: <i>The popular costumes of Turkey in 1873</i>	174
Stefan Verkovich: <i>Veda Slovena</i>	181
Teodosij Gologanov: <i>Letter on the renewal of the Archbishopric of Ohrid</i>	188
Mihai Eminescu: <i>Political articles</i>	194

Chapter III. The Nationalization of Space

Ján Kollár: <i>The Daughter of Sláva</i>	205
Adam Mickiewicz: <i>Pan Tadeusz</i>	211
István Széchenyi: <i>Hunnia</i>	224
Ljudevit Gaj: <i>Proclamations</i>	230
Ilija Garašanin: <i>The draft</i>	238
Ioannis Kolettis: <i>Of this great idea</i>	244
Karel Havlíček Borovský: <i>The Slav and the Czech</i>	249
<i>Petition to the Emperor against the unification of Bohemia and Moravia</i>	255
Johann Majláth: <i>An examination of the question: whether to annex the Carpathian Slavs and Ruthenians to the Magyars</i>	262
Lajos Kossuth: <i>Proposal. Concerning the future political establishment of Hungary</i>	268
Alecu Russo: <i>The song of Romania</i>	277
Petar Beron: <i>Slavic philosophy</i>	284
Ahmed Midhat Efendi: <i>The basis of reform</i>	291
Sami Frashëri: <i>Albania, what it was, what it is and what it will be?</i>	297

Chapter IV. The Nation and Its Neighbors in Europe: Problems of Coexistence

Markos Renieris: <i>What is Greece? West or East?</i>	307
Viktor von Andrian-Werburg: <i>Austria and her future</i>	315
František Palacký: <i>Letter to Frankfurt, 11 April 1848</i>	322
Miklós Wesselényi: <i>Oration on the matter of the Hungarian and Slavonic nationalities</i>	330
Janko Drašković: <i>Dissertation, or Treatise</i>	339
Ludovít Šuhajda: <i>Magyarism in Hungary</i>	348
Lajos Mocsáry: <i>Nationality</i>	354
Stefan Buszczyński: <i>The future of Austria</i>	361
Svetozar Miletić: <i>The Eastern Question</i>	366
Ion C. Brătianu: <i>Nationality</i>	373
<i>Memorandum of the Secret Central Bulgarian Committee</i>	380

Chapter V. National Heroism: Revolution and Counter-Revolution

Dositej Obradović: <i>Rise, O Serbia</i>	391
Alexandros Ypsilantis: <i>Fight for Faith and Motherland!</i>	396
Dionysios Solomos: <i>Hymn to Liberty</i>	403
Adam Mickiewicz: <i>Prophecies</i>	408
Henryk Kamieński: <i>Vital truths of the Polish nation</i>	421
Petar II Petrović Njegoš: <i>The mountain wreath</i>	428
Franz Grillparzer: <i>Field-marshal Radetzky</i>	436
Sándor Petöfi: <i>National song</i>	440
<i>Requests of the Slovak nation</i>	445
Jevrem Grujić: <i>A vision of the state</i>	451
Zsigmond Kemény: <i>After the revolution</i>	455
Nicolae Bălcescu: <i>The course of revolution in the history of the Romanians</i>	463
Hristo Botev: <i>Hadji Dimiter, The hanging of Vasil Levski</i>	473
<i>Two Macedonian manifestos</i>	478
Namık Kemal: <i>Motherland, or Silistra</i>	486
Mehmed Akif: <i>Hymn to Independence</i>	494

INTRODUCTION

The 'Identity Reader' Project

The present volume is the second one of the series entitled *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe (1770–1945): Texts and Commentaries*. The history of this venture goes back to the meeting of a group of young scholars at the Balkan Summer University in Plovdiv in 1999. Step by step, a research project, hosted by the Center for Advanced Study Sofia, was formed with the intention of bringing together and making accessible basic texts of the respective national traditions. The ensuing 'Reader' was envisioned as a challenge to the self-centered and 'isolationist' historical narratives and educational canons prevalent in the region. On the whole, the 'Reader' is expected to fill in the lacunae concerning the knowledge of Central and Southeast Europe pertinent to the very core of the schooling process and academic socialization in these countries. It is hoped that our project will broaden the field of possible comparisons and make researchers look at the process of nation-building in Central and Southeast Europe from a comparative perspective.

The grouping of the texts follows neither the national provenience, nor *stricto sensu* chronological order. It is determined more by thematic similarities and resonances. The four 'meta-themes/periods,' around which the four volumes are organized, are the following: Late Enlightenment (the emergence of the modern 'National Idea'); National Romanticism (the formation of national movements); Modernism (the full development of national movements and often the creation of national states); and Anti-Modernism (concentrating mainly on the radical ideologies of the inter-war period).

Within these thematic units the project analyzes various aspects of identity-formation, such as 'symbolic geography', the symbolic representation of the national community, images of the past and the production of cultural markers (i.e., national language or national character), as well as the images of the other and the 'construction' of identity in religious and socio-

cultural contexts – domains that themselves exhibit revealing similarities. This framework challenges the usual taxonomies through the *dis-aggregation* of a nominally unified past. In particular, this perspective questions the idea of a single point of departure that we are confronted with in nationalist histories. In fact, most of the texts selected consciously participate in many registers of identity-construction, seeking to turn the entire symbolic framework of identities into a more dynamic configuration.

In order to create a common basis for the analysis of the collected texts, each entry has a similar structure. The first section refers to the bibliographical data containing the language in which the text was written, its author and the publishing house; this data is complemented by short information about the author, such as his (her) place of birth and death, a concise biography, and main works. The second section contains a short ‘contextualization’ of the text, describing its political and social background and the intellectual environment in which it originated. Then, a textual analysis, a description of its ideological tendencies and historical influence and its function in the respective canon follow. In addition, the most important interpretations of the text are provided. All this is followed by the translated texts. If possible, we chose to publish them in their entirety, but in many cases their length exceeded the dimensions of the volume, and thus we strove to present the most characteristic excerpts.

*

During the years of intensive research and interaction, our group incurred a number of precious debts. First of all, we would like to thank Diana Mishkova who supported the project from the beginning and has helped us far beyond the scope commonly expected from the director of a hosting institution to bring these volumes to completion. We are also extremely grateful to the entire staff of the Center for Advanced Study Sofia who facilitated our work immensely during our numerous meetings and provided a pleasant working atmosphere in all regards.

No collaborative project of this sort is viable without substantial financial help making it possible for the participants to meet regularly. We are grateful to the Prince Bernhard Cultural Foundation (The Netherlands) for providing generous funding that made it possible for the group to meet on six occasions over the period of three years. When the first phase of the project was finished, the Foundation also offered a further grant to prepare the texts for publication. Without this generosity, it would have been impossible to share our

findings with the broader public. Our special thanks goes to Wouter Hugenholz (NIAS), who took upon himself the role of introducing the project to the Foundation and who followed with immense trust and sympathy our work throughout these years.

A natural focus of any comparative research in the region, the Central European University also gave us generous help to accomplish our venture. Most of all, we would like to thank László Kontler and Sorin Antohi who have been with us from the very beginning of the project, offering logistic help, sharing their advice with us and also contributing to the volumes with their insightful introductions. We are grateful to Halil Berktaş (Sabancı University, Istanbul) for his intellectual support throughout these years and also for hosting us for a workshop in 2001 where the project was first presented to a broader academic public.

While preparing the manuscript for publication, the editors at CEU Press, Richárd Rados, Anikó Kádár and Linda Kunos, provided us with important advice and took care of the burdensome institutional side of the publishing with exemplary commitment. Last, but not least, Frank Schaer edited the material linguistically with utmost care and showed extreme empathy towards the various regional variants of pigeon English.

Miroslav Hroch: National Romanticism

The end of the eighteenth century and first decades of the nineteenth were in many respects a watershed period in European history. The dramatic convulsions of the French Revolution revealed, and opened, viable as well as unviable roads for the future development of European society. In connection with the ideas of the Enlightenment it shattered the old bonds and cast doubt upon the established moral and social norms that continued to stem from the basis of the old corporate society. The Napoleonic wars integrated Russia once and for all into the political and, indirectly, cultural history of Europe. The steam engine and other technical achievements signalled the advent of the industrial revolution. In arts and culture, a new trend, Romanticism, was successfully asserting itself against Classicism. At the same time, though with less success, it had pretences also of becoming a new 'way of life.' The civil service was rationalized and bureaucratized. And, above all, a new group identity was announced, which, partly on the basis of the existing structure of the European states, partly in opposition to it, elevated the nation as the supreme value and fundamental 'centrum securitatis.'

Was it only coincidental timing or was there a causal relation, direct or indirect, that linked together all these changes? Our chief interest here will be the relation between Romanticism and national identity, even though, as we shall see, these two notions or, if you like, evolutionary trends cannot be understood without the context of the other great changes of the period. A consideration of the relationship between Romanticism and national consciousness suggests from the beginning two questions that we need to consider first if we wish to avoid misunderstanding and superficial models:

1. What is national about Romanticism?
2. What is Romantic about the nation?

These clearly are questions that cannot be answered without some preliminary consideration of terminology. One cannot think of Romanticism

solely as a literary trend; in the main it is an approach to life, which was projected also into a value system and into conduct as well as into works of art. What was the nature of that approach to life? Usually, by 'Romantic approach' one understands a strong emphasis on emotion, the subjectivization of attitudes, an attempt to be unconventional, the absence of a realistic approach to the world, and so forth. There is, however, no generally accepted definition of Romanticism, and when we do come across a consensus about it among experts, it tends to be in the negative definition: Romanticism is labeled a reaction to Enlightenment rationalism and cool, restrained Classicism. Although even that is not an entirely unambiguous characterization (we find the emphasis on emotion even in the Sentimentalism of the eighteenth century), it is evident that it tends to apply more to art than to approaches to life. And it is the latter that are of particular interest to us for our topic, the relationship between national identity and Romanticism.

I believe that what constitutes the common denominator of so-called Romantic approaches to life can be called a sense of social alienation, a feeling of loneliness, which stems from a sense of insecurity, from the disrupted harmony of the world. This feeling was not widespread: it was shared chiefly by men and women of letters, philosophers, and the educated on the whole. They sought a different way out of the situation and it cannot therefore be characterized without a certain, though probably simplistic, typology. We can distinguish at least five roads to a new sense of security, to a sense of belonging. These roads, which were meant to become ways out of the crisis, were not mutually exclusive; they may, depending on the case, also be complementary, and we do not therefore encounter them in pure forms. Nevertheless, we can usually say that in the approaches and views of this or that author, or this or that great figure, some of these ideas dominated and others occupied a secondary position, and though they do not appear in a pure form, some tended usually to predominate.

The fundamental road that was meant to lead the Romantics to a new sense of security was the road of individualization and subjectivization: one could find this sense of security in a deep, intense personal relationship—in love, often unrequited, for someone of the opposite sex, who was usually idealized, and in friendship with someone of the same sex. The search for personal security by turning to love merely seemed to be a safe, unproblematic road: on the contrary, it often became the source of new insecurities. That search for new individualized values and relationships concerned the inner self and therefore ran opposite to the search for the great new community, the 'nation.'

No less complicated, but socially more relevant, was the search for a stability of relationships by turning to the past: from the gloomy reality of the present the Romantic turned to an idealized picture of ages past, of which the Middle Ages enjoyed the greatest popularity, whether as a counterweight to the Antiquity so beloved of Classicism, or as a model of high-principled valor, the certain virtue of knights so different from the complicated people of the present. The historicism of the Romantics, however, also had another aspect: the individual sought continuity, a connection with previous generations, at the levels of both the individual and the community that he or she identified with.

This historicizing component of the search for security could strengthen the group identity, which either already existed or had been rediscovered, by searching for a common fate, shared heroism, or the suffering of the national community in the distant or recent past. It was in this historical context that the relationship to the community, 'the nation,' moved, as we shall see, to the fore. It would, however, be an over-simplification if we reduced this turn to history to a Romantic approach. What is called the 'historicism of the nineteenth century' had deeper, more complex roots.

Another search for new stability led the Romantics to the common people, and was not infrequently connected precisely with those elements of historicism or, more precisely, with that component of the turn to the past, which was fashioning the myth of the 'Golden Age,' a time when people were still sincere, selfless, and unspoiled by civilization. More often, however, it was a search for the ideal of the common people in the present day—among the simple country-folk (and therefore in folk art too) on the one hand, and among the natives of distant lands on the other; it was in this context that the popular construct of the 'noble savage' was born. This context also includes, however, the idealization of the common man, usually a peasant or countryman, as the vehicle of elementary, universally human, national values.

The feeling of being uprooted sometimes led also to a rejection of society and to a revolt against it. In the mental world of all revolution and revolutionaries in the first half of the nineteenth century, views and approaches appear which are usually called expressions of Romanticism and Romantic utopianism: faith in man and his sound moral core, criticism of the world that was based on selfishness and the exploitation or oppression of others, and hence a desire for a new, better world. Many a time, the radical, that is to say, violent, methods and means used by revolutionaries to achieve their ends are called 'Romantic.'

For our context the most important search for a way out of the crisis of values and identity was the search for a new community in which the individual who was freed from the bonds of corporate society and stripped of a sense of security could put down roots, a community with which he or she could identify. The search for a new collective spirit need not necessarily have the character of a revolutionary dream of a new society: it can lead to a community of a new kind—namely, the nation. The term ‘nation’ was itself already part of the vocabulary of the educated at the time (as a designation of inhabitants of a state and as a designation of an ethnic community), but it now acquired a value connotation and emotional charge, which was allied to both the Romantics and, to some extent, their works.

We are now coming to the answer to our first question, which asked what was national about Romanticism. At the time of its creation the national movement, national consciousness, had much in common with Romanticism, though not in the sense of a direct causal connection. It was more a matter of the shared roots of the two phenomena. The turn to national identity also grew out of the crisis of identity, which was brought about by changes at the dawn of the modern era: the loss of religious legitimacy and also therefore the loss of axiomatically formulated principles, the weakening of the old traditional feudal and patriarchal bonds, and, from that, the loss of security.

We can with relative ease demonstrate empirically that national movements, seeking to achieve a new national identity, were making their appearance in a period of serious cultural, social, and political convulsions. In the German, Czech, and Hungarian cases these convulsions stemmed, on the one hand, from the impact of Enlightenment reforms and, on the other, from wars against the French Revolution, and especially from the experience of Napoleon’s triumph. The national movement in the Baltic began in the period of internal crisis in the Tsarist empire and the great reforms of Alexander II; the Flemish movement began as a reaction to the creation of the Belgian state; the Finnish as a reaction to separation from Sweden in conjunction with the autonomous status of the country; the Serbian and Greek movements of national liberation began in the period of internal crisis in the Ottoman Empire after the reforms of Sultan Selim III (1761–1807) (and, in the Greek case, also in response to the French Revolution), and so forth.

We can therefore answer the first question by saying that each of the national and Romantic approaches had similar social roots, and preoccupation with the nation was logically one of the roads the Romantics set out on in search of new security and new community.

What does this entail for our second question, which inquired into what was Romantic about the nation? It would definitely be a gross error if, without deeper thought and empirical verification, we inferred from a certain concurrence of the coordinates along which the national and Romantic approach moved that the modern nation as a large social group was a product of Romanticism. It is first necessary to distance oneself from an idea which the selection of authors in this Reader could lead us to—namely, that at a certain phase in the formation of the modern nation it was the Romantic approaches that were decisive. What phase exactly are we talking about? And which nations?

For a better understanding of these complex social processes we must distinguish between them. This general rule of scholarly inquiry applies fully also to the subject of the formation of nations. This process cannot be considered at the level of the 'nation in and of itself' or at the level of the nebulous, ambiguous term 'nationalism.' We must first make clear for ourselves the typological, spatial, and temporal differences.

The modern nations, which are today known mostly as nations with their own states, came into being essentially by two roads. In one case, the state was, at the start of the national formation, an established continuity of political independence, at least from the Early Modern Age onwards, but more often from the Middle Ages. These were states with their own, to a large extent linguistically homogeneous, 'national elites,' with a mature culture in the vernacular, which was also the language of the state. The road to the modern nation led, by means of an internal transformation of the state or of its society from a corporate to a civil society that began to define itself as a national society. This road led from state to nation, and the term 'nation-state,' a new concept, therefore seems to be justified.

The struggle for the modern nation defined as a community of equal citizens took place mainly as a political struggle and was therefore quite remote from Romanticism. To be sure, here and there we encounter engagé Romantics of the Victor Hugo type in the role of champions of the democratization of the national society, but this was mostly a pragmatic power struggle, in both the nation-state and its relationship to neighboring states or nations. Romantic outpourings about love for the nation or language tend not to appear in France, Great Britain, and the Netherlands till the later phases of the fully formed national society.

It must be said that this type of development towards the modern nation was absent in Central and Eastern Europe. A different type was typical of this part of Europe, with its political basis and platform being in most cases a

multi-ethnic empire—the Russian, Habsburg, or Ottoman—inhabited by many non-ruling ethnic groups. A sub-variety had its basis in the form of a literary ‘national culture,’ which was not connected to the state (the German, Italian, and Polish cases). Leaving aside the fact that the ruling élites in each of these three multi-ethnic empires searched for their national identity only gradually, we note that development towards a modern nation in this area assumed the form of a national movement, that is to say, a struggle to achieve the attributes considered necessary for national existence. In the German, Italian, and Polish cases the national movements took the form of a struggle for one missing attribute, that is to say, political independence, a nation-state that was meant to embody the otherwise culturally and socially formed modern nation.

Lacking not only statehood, but also a complete social structure and a tradition of their own culture in their own national language, the non-ruling ethnic groups in the multi-ethnic empires were in the most complicated situation. Their national movement pursued the aims of cultural and social emancipation and also, albeit sometimes with a considerable time-lag, political emancipation, which was often far from taking the form of clamoring for statehood. The national movements cannot, however, be seen as currents that remained the same from their beginnings. Like every other social movement, they too went through three phases, which we may distinguish according to the degree of mobilization achieved by a given group and according to the type of discourse promoting the idea of the nation.

The earliest phase was the period when—usually owing to the thirst for learning of the men and women of the Enlightenment—the ethnic group, its culture, past, state in nature, customs, and so forth, became a subject of academic interest. In this phase, basic linguistic norms were sought and formulated and historical contexts were traced; in short, the potential nation was defined in a scholarly fashion according to the individual features that distinguished it from other groups. The Enlightenment scholars did not, however, necessarily come from the ranks of the *ethnie* for which they had sympathy and in which they took an interest.

Although Enlightenment rationalism predominated in this scholarly interest, one cannot rule out certain emotional factors. Very often, researchers so identified with their subject of inquiry that they assumed an emotional relationship to them. Among the national movements that experienced this phase later, in the course of the nineteenth century, we know of cases when, by contrast, the emotional relationship to the nation or, more precisely, the *ethnie*, became the motivation to do scholarly work. Blood ties, however, were not

decisive: many scholars studied an *ethnie* from which they did not originate and whose language was not their mother tongue.

Not until the emergence of social and cultural conditions that we characterized as a crisis of identity did a group that saw national identity as the most natural response to that crisis and the nation as a value in itself begin to break off from the ranks of patriotic intellectuals. The leading actors of the national movement, in the proper sense of the word, resolved to sell their fellow citizens, members of their ethnic group, on this idea. The phase of national agitation began, of resolute efforts to convince members of the potential nation that their national identity should be a source of pride. The nation was meant to become the basic security that they could turn to for protection, but also an obligation, a group for which it was necessary to work, whose members it was necessary not only to identify with but also, indeed mainly, to be in solidarity with.

Among the writings of the intellectual propagandists for the national cause we come across a number of Romantic approaches, but also a number of rationally argued demands espousing Enlightenment ideals. Hypothetically, one may assume that the approaches of each of the propagandists included rational Enlightenment or realistically pragmatic elements, which were more or less strongly represented together with approaches that have conventionally been called 'Romantic.' For that matter, Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803), who is usually mentioned as the source of ideas and inspirer of Romantic approaches to the people and the nation, is not included among the Romantic philosophers and, given his dates, belongs clearly to the Enlightenment. Some of his ideas, however, would later be in accord with the approach of the Romantics, and would serve to strengthen their arguments. We know also of other cases, of course, when 'Herderian' ideas appear in the works of authors who had not read him.

A similar cross-fertilization appears in the works of the leading propagandists of the nation. Let us consider several examples. Certainly, the enthusiasm of Josef Jungmann (1773–1847) for the Czech language and its spreading may reasonably be considered a reflection of Romantic influences, even though inspired by the pre-Romantic Herder. Jungmann's argument, that mere knowledge of Czech put members of the Czech *ethnie* at an extreme disadvantage, is, however, for the most part rational and modern. Mihail Kogălniceanu (1817–1891) could, on the one hand, weave Romantic dreams of the past of the Romanian nation, but also, in the wholly modern spirit, push for agrarian reform. The same is true of the 'Westernization' of Greece called for and proclaimed by the 'Romantic' Markos Renieris (1815–1897). The

program of Karel Havlíček Borovský (1821–1856) of Czech national identity is an explicit argument against the Romantic conception of nationality. Similarly, one can probably not unambiguously include in the ‘Romantic’ category figures who had meteoric political careers, such as Ioannis Kolettis (1774–1847).

In sum, as it is impossible to draw a sharp, generally valid line separating the Enlightenment approach from the Romantic, it is also impossible to set Romantic approaches and modernization ones against each other, though in some cases it would really be possible to find historical figures symbolizing the counterpart of Romanticism and modernism.

By contrast, it holds that Romanticism in relation to the nation can neither be limited to the first half of the nineteenth century nor located in the second, propaganda phase of the national movement. We encounter conspicuously Romantic approaches not only in the phase of national agitation, but also, much later, in the third phase of the national movement, which is distinguished by the modern nation already being fully established and national identity achieving mass acceptance. The cult of language, the Romantic idealization of the past, and the cult of the common people were stereotypes that accompanied the national movement also to the time when it was fully formed and national existence was assured—not infrequently in the form of the nation-state.

Our question concerning what is Romantic about nation-promoting activity is still not answered by this relativizing statement. The approaches we characterize as Romantic had, to be sure, their own special place in the forming of the nation. In order to determine their role we must, however, ask what roads the processes of forming the modern nation actually took. For this we need also to reflect on the actual concept of nation or, as the case may be, the relationship between nation and ‘nationalism.’

So far I have ignored a term that appears often in the ‘Reader’—namely, ‘nationalism.’ Unlike the term ‘nation,’ which is documented in most European languages in the period before the actual beginning of the formation of modern nations, ‘nationalism’ emerged as a new concept in the political discourse, which loaded it from the beginning with evaluative political connotations, usually negative. Not till the period between the two world wars did it begin to be used—actually only in the United States—as an instrument of scholarly historical analysis. Particularly after the Second World War, when the term became common, the tension between the concept ‘nationalism,’ with its negative connotations, and the organically originating term, ‘nation,’ with its positive connotations, became fully apparent.

Confusion is increased by the fact that 'nationalism' is in various languages interpreted in connection with how 'nation' is understood in any particular language. If, in English, 'the nation' is very close to 'the state,' then 'nationalism' is also understood mainly as efforts aiming one way or another towards statehood. If in German '*die Nation*' is defined chiefly by culture and language, the term '*Nationalismus*' found itself in an inherently contradictory position, because it can mean precisely this exaggerated emphasis on the linguistic and cultural designation of nationality, as politically defined opposition to this sort of conception of nation. Added to this is the conscious or subconscious linking of nationalism with negative expressions of national consciousness and struggles 'in the name of the nation.'

Some authors have tried to forestall this confusion by differentiating between various kinds of nationalism. Thus, for example, in the period between the two world wars Carlton J. H. Hayes (1882–1964) differentiated between six types of nationalism (including Liberal, Jacobin, and integral). Hans Kohn (1891–1971), writing later, was satisfied with two: progressive 'Western' nationalism derived from the ideals of the French Revolution, which he called the counterpart to the reactionary nationalism of the 'non-Western' (that is, German) kind, which was focused on language, culture, and consanguinity. Similarly, Liah Greenfeld discusses positive nationalism (English and American) and negative (German and Russian).

It seems under these circumstances that it is inappropriate to project the term 'nationalism,' which is anyway nebulous and has various connotations, to the past and talk about the 'nationalists' of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries or even the Middle Ages. If the term can be applied to all activities oriented to the existence of the nation, it seems more appropriate to employ the term 'national consciousness' or 'national identity' for this wide range of activities. Moreover, the terms 'identity' and 'collective identity' have the advantage of enabling one to work with combinations of several group identities (the nation, country, region, state, town, and so forth) and with the transformative nature of relations between these identities within some hierarchy.

The difficulties with 'nationalism' have another, today possibly more relevant, component. Increasingly in current research the view is promoted that the nations in general and the small nations in Central and Eastern Europe in particular were 'constructed' solely (or chiefly) as the creation of intellectuals trying to attain positions of power, dispel frustration, or work out the subjective problems of an identity crisis. In other words, the nation is presented as the product of nationalism. From this point of view, the authors of the 'Ro-

mantic' texts presented in this volume may appear as the 'creators' or 'inventors' of the modern Czech, Bulgarian, Serbian, and other nations.

From the point of view of causal explication, the thesis about the nation as the product of specific nationalists or abstract nationalism contributes nothing at all. Causality is merely shifted onto another level: one must ask why this 'nationalism' emerged and why this particular one succeeded but another not. To be more specific: why was 'nationalism' of the Czechs and Slovaks successful, but the officially, zealously promoted, Czechoslovak 'nationalism' not? Why was Serbian, Croatian and even Muslim 'nationalism' successful but Illyrian not? Why was Ukrainian 'nationalism' more successful than Belarusian? Why did neither the 'nationalism' of intellectuals from the ranks of the Lusatian Sorbs, so active in their time, nor that of the Kashubians result in the creation of a modern nation? Why later did the construct of the Šariš nation fail? Was it perhaps a matter of how enthusiastically the individual propagandists made their speeches and how devotedly they worked? Another possibility is that we, in agreement with Ernest Gellner, shall say that nationalism is a result of the great social shocks and transformations, which he sums up as 'industrialization.'

One must bear in mind the inadequacy of the interpretation of the nation-forming processes from simple 'nationalistic' activity, which also relativizes the importance of Romanticism as the nation-forming force from which nationalism seems to have drawn its inspiration. The role of Romanticism—providing that we mean by it increased emotionality, the search for new security, and growing subjectivization—was manifested rather in verbalization and stylization, which functioned as commentary or catalyst. Yet it was not only a matter of commentary and an approach to objective processes, but also one of the articulation and form that the rationalization of these activities and efforts assumed, which aimed at the mobilization of the masses of the nation.

That is why it is important to place the 'Romantic' approaches into the context of factors that determined the formation of modern nations, especially in the conditions of the national movements. In the current debate between the 'Constructivists' and 'Essentialists' (or 'Primordialists') it makes sense to avoid polemical biases. Despite the differences of opinion, which are intensified by an attempt to come up with ever new, more inventive solutions, there is a certain, albeit not always admitted consensus: all the relevant authors acknowledge that for the formation of the nation, or for the road to a modern nation, five factors, or contexts, must be taken into account.

1. Every nation, every national movement, sought and found a certain temporal dimension in its existence, or, more precisely, an historical dimension of the life of its members. The past was presented by the national movement at two levels, which cannot be placed in opposition to each other: on the one hand, objectively existing institutional remnants of the past (for example, the provincial high court, the diet, the frontiers, the capital city, castles and manor houses, urban architecture); on the other, 'collective memory,' the construction of national history, which sometimes also included tales of national heroes and national adversaries. At this second level, the level of collective memory and the creation of national myths, Romanticism could to a certain extent also be employed.

2. The nation-forming processes usually had their own linguistic and ethnic component, whether a vernacular, which sought the road to codification, or the rationalistic linguistic unification of state territory. Linguistic homogenization was anyway a process that ran in parallel with the formation of modern nations, where both processes often penetrated each other and also clashed. Here, as well, we must differentiate between two levels: the level of objectively existing linguistic ties and markers of ethnicity, and the level of the subjective perception of language, the glorification of language. The cult of folk customs and folk art, which is usually linked with Romanticism, was often strikingly employed here.

3. The formation of nations proceeded roughly in parallel with the processes of modernization, which, however, cannot be reduced to industrialization, as Gellner would have it. The changes brought on by modernization, therefore, include increasing social mobility and migration, as well as the introduction of rational administration, universal education, and the expansion of communications. Without a certain level of education among the public, without a certain level of social communication, any national propaganda was doomed to failure. Here lies the boundary that even the most enthusiastic Romantic could not break through.

4. National agitation, the national idea, could only be comprehensible to the masses and acceptable to them if it corresponded to some extent with their everyday experience: in that case, it was the experience of conflict, in particular, which most stimulated each social movement. In short, the generally recognized factors of national mobilization include the existence of nationally relevant conflicts of interest. By those I mean the kinds of conflicts where the groups clashing are differentiated not only by their interests but also by their language, ethnicity, or nationality. It could be, say, a conflict between a peasant whose mother tongue was Estonian (or Lithuanian,

Ukrainian, Slovenian) and a German or Polish-speaking landowner, or a conflict between ethnically different groups of officials over posts in the civil service. Ultimately, the struggle for political power among the politicians of various nationalities was also of this nature. The contribution of Romanticism and of the Romantics to the verbalization of these conflicts, or in the 'translation' of a conflict of interests into the language of nationalist conflict, could sometimes be considerable.

5. Socio-psychological factors, which aimed at the feelings of people, were employed in national agitation, and could, under certain circumstances and over a certain period, become the domain of the Romantics. This is true of national celebrations, funerals of important people, and public protests. Here, however, one must also take into account manipulation, the cool calculating use of emotional elements in education for nationhood. One must bear in mind, however, that this emotional form of national movement and national aims could be effective only on the assumption that the individual movements had already reached a mass level, that is to say, when there was no longer any doubt about the successful culmination of the nation-building process.

Differences between the individual authors, or the individual theories of nationalism, are usually the result not of the rejection of some groups of denominators, but of how much importance the authors ascribe to each of the five factors. An interpretation of an historical transformation process as complex as the formation of the modern nation which considers only a single cause, must be consigned to the realm of wishful thinking.

The place of Romanticism in national ideology and its influence on the factors of national agitation must therefore be judged soberly. Certainly, we come across expressions that can clearly be classed under Romanticism (disregarding the fact that the term is used with different accents for different cultures). Mostly, however, the approaches of the propagandists at the inception of the national movement and also of those during its mass phase are marked by a combination of rational and emotive arguments, a combination of idealistic declarations and pragmatic politics, and also by personal engagement.

Consequently, it is important to determine who the leaders of the national movements were in the propaganda phase, and who formulated the 'national program' and national demands. Without wanting to contrive a primitive direct link between the social standing of an author and his ideas, we would argue that it is clear that a national movement whose leaders come mainly from the ranks of the aristocracy will, in its forms and demands, be different

from a national movement whose leaders are connected chiefly with the farmers or pen-pushers. It would, of course, be interesting to analyze the relationship between the social composition, or social bases of the leaders of the national movement, and the proportion of Romantic feeling and arguments in their propaganda.

Another aspect of the problem is the question of the audience to whom the national agitation was directed. Who were the texts addressed to, who were the readers of the texts that we have before us? Here it will again be useful to differentiate between a once-existing audience (the actual initial readers of these texts) on the one hand, and the intended audience (those whom the author considered to be his audience, who imagined them as his national public) on the other. One can, at the same time, also trace a certain stereotype of 'national reader' or, rather, the ideal type of 'patriot,' the pioneer of the national movement.

What qualities were projected into the figure of this ideal patriot? The fundamental character trait of the patriot was, understandably, devotion to the nation, to the country, a willingness to sacrifice oneself for the nation, that is to say, for the members of that nation. Devotion to supra-personal national values and interests was of course contingent on a certain amount of knowledge: the patriot knew, or was convinced that he knew, who belonged to the nation and what demands served the national interest. In relation to this definition two questions arise:

First, in what relationship were these patriotic virtues to Romanticism? One frequently hears the opinion that the decision to sacrifice oneself for one's nation, to work in its interest, is a sort of quintessence of the 'Romantic' approach. Was it not, after all, the Romantic heroes who sacrificed themselves for their nation in Poland, Hungary, or Bulgaria? This generalization, however, has a serious drawback: to sacrifice oneself for one's country (*pro patria mori*) was a crucial virtue of classical antiquity, communicated to young people by Classical education dating in Europe from the period of Humanism. We could therefore in the best case say that the humanist tradition of education used to give the Romantics certain moral norms, which could be applied also in the national interest. Moreover, work and sacrifice for the nation were requirements of many later political movements, which could definitely no longer be identified with Romanticism.

Second, the idea of who constitutes the nation and of which specific persons, strata, groups and classes belong to 'my' nation was not coherent, and was to a decisive extent conditioned, on the one hand, by the social composition of the ethnic group that the national movement came out of, and, on the

other, by who formulated the idea. Evidently, we cannot unconditionally include in the same category both the patriotic 'Romantic' statements of the rich aristocrat or leading politician, and the patriotic statements of a provincial teacher or self-taught farmer. Here, too, it is a matter of an important corrective in the study of the relationship between the mental world of Romanticism and the mental world of 'nationalism.'

The question of author is only one side of the coin. The other side comprises the addressee. Here, too, one must carefully differentiate. The national argument, which turned to the educated upper-middle classes and to people who had already gone through the political schooling of a corporate or even constitutional monarchy, could employ abstract concepts from the vocabulary of the civil movement, liberalism, democratism, Jacobinism and so forth. Concepts such as 'freedom of the press,' 'the right to petition the government,' 'the right peaceably to assemble,' and so forth were, on the other hand, not attractive enough (and often probably unintelligible) where national propaganda turned to members of an ethnic group, who were of the common people or had no opportunity to gain political experience, and for whom the reference to a shared language, customs, or shared king and country were more comprehensible.

If we consider the structure of the demands of the individual national movements, the difference stands out among the national movements that were first oriented towards cultural and linguistic demands (the Czechs, Slovaks, Lithuanians, Estonians, Finns, and Slovenians) and those which as early as the phase of national propaganda emphasized political autonomy, sometimes aiming towards the creation of the nation-state (the Serbs, Greeks, Magyars, and Poles). This difference cannot be explained by the different levels of progressiveness of this or that nation or by 'national character.' Nor will reference to Romanticism or Herder help us much. We can find Romantic elements in the loving cult of language amongst the Czechs and the Finns, as well as in the rebellious heroism of the Poles and Magyars.

We achieve a more convincing interpretation if we take into account the social background of individual national movements. It will then be clear that political aims were prioritized at the beginning of the national movement mainly by those movements that could base themselves on the non-ruling ethnic group with a complete social structure, that is to say, with its 'own' elite, ruling classes, such as the nobility in the Polish and Magyar cases and the Phanariots in the Greek case. There is, of course, also a certain parallel here with the German and Italian national movements. By contrast, in the conditions of the ethnic groups with an incomplete social structure, the na-

tional propaganda was aimed at strata that lacked political experience and political education, strata for which it was simpler to talk about language as the fundamental link that united the nation against its enemies, who were, however, characterized not only ethnically but also socially. It is also symptomatic that the social demands came into the national program beside linguistic demands more strongly and intensively than in nations where the national movements were dominated by the ruling classes.

This substantial difference, which stems from the clear correlation between the structure of the national program and the social structure of the members of the ethnic group, must also be considered in the selection and analysis of patriotic texts. Certainly the Romantic elements in the cultural-linguistic program were of a status and form different from those (providing there were any at all) in the political program. Emotional propaganda stood a greater chance of having an impact in a milieu that was already imbued with Romantic education.

In sum, it is reasonable to say that the possibilities of explaining the formation of the modern nation by looking at the effects of Romanticism are clearly limited. In conditions of political repression, Romanticism took a form different from the one it assumed in the period when the national movement—independently of the ideas of the Romantics—came into the context of the revolutionary struggle for social emancipation, as was the case, for example, in Central Europe in 1848. The successes or failures of the national movement depended neither on the strength of the Romanticism of the leading actors of the nation or the national movement nor on the influence of Romanticism among the ruling élites.

The idea of Romantic nationalism or the Romantic stage in the development of national ideology is a construction based on the idea that a certain irrationality and strong emotionality is present in both Romanticism and nationalism. But, as I have argued here, the designation 'Romantic' hardly covers all the characteristics of the national thinking and national platforms of this period, and is certainly not the predominant designation. That is why I believe that the opposite construct is more correct, less removed from reality—namely, the construct of national Romanticism as the designation for that branch of Romantic approaches that sought a way out of the crisis and a solution to its conflicts in the fact that they would be affiliated with the new community, the nation, which was easy to endow with a certain emotional attractiveness.

Translated from Czech by Derek Paton

DÁNIEL BERZSENYI: TO THE HUNGARIANS

Title: *A magyarokhoz I.* (To the Hungarians, I.)

Originally published: In *Berzsenyi Dániel Versei*, edited by Mihály Helmeczi, Pest, János Trattner, 1813

Language: Hungarian

The poem exists in various versions, written between 1796 and 1810. The definitive version dates from 1810. The modern edition is *Berzsenyi Dániel összes művei* (Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1956), pp. 125–127.

About the author

Dániel Berzsenyi [1776, Egyházashetye (Southwest Hungary) – 1836, Nikla (Southwest Hungary)]: poet. He was the offspring of a noble family of Lutheran denomination. He entered Sopron Lutheran Lyceum around 1790, where he acquired the basis of his education, especially in Latin and German poetry. He married in 1799 and led the lifestyle of the lesser nobility in Southwest Hungary. As a poet he was discovered by the circle of Ferenc Kazinczy. He emerged as one of the most important literary figures of the first two decades of the nineteenth century, acquiring fame for his mastery of Greek and Latin verse forms. Although initially he was considered a poet of exemplary genius, he eventually clashed with the leading Hungarian *literati*. In 1817 **Ferenc Kölcsey** published an unsympathetic review of the 1816 edition of his poems in the only Hungarian-language scholarly periodical of the time, *Tudományos Gyűjtemény* (Scientific collection). Berzsenyi's counter-attack, *Antirecensió Kölcsey recenziójára* (Counter-review to the review by Kölcsey) aroused much opposition. In the ensuing phase of his career he concerned himself mostly with the questions of aesthetics, seeking to support his negative evaluation of Kölcsey's writings. His melancholy, to which he was periodically subject from 1809 onwards, became increasingly deeper. Although he became a regular member of the Academy in 1830, he declined to move permanently to Pest and felt himself marginalized. He has been canonized in Hungarian literary history as the major figure of transition from classicism to romanticism. In the twentieth century he has also been interpreted as a tragically misunderstood genius (see **László Németh**, *In minority*).

Main works: *Versei* [Poems] (1813, second enlarged edition: 1816); *A magyarországi mezeti szorgalom némely akadályairól* [On some of the hindrances to agriculture in Hungary] (1833); *Poetai Harmonistica* [Poetic harmonistics] (1833); *Összes művei* [Collected works], 3 vols., (Edited by Gábor Döbrentei, 1842).

Context

After the ferment of the early 1790s, culminating in the short-lived experiment of parliamentarism and the ill-fated ‘Jacobin conspiracy,’ the Hungarian political elite experienced a deep crisis both in cultural and in political terms. The two decades after 1795 were marked by the withdrawal of the most important intellectual figures to the private sphere, although the landholders enjoyed considerable economic prosperity due to the agrarian boom in the years of the Napoleonic wars. At the same time, the wars demonstrated the inability of the Hungarian gentry to cope with the radically altered conditions of modern warfare. In short, socio-economic and political transformation was challenging the traditional social and cultural self-image of the nation. Dániel Berzsenyi responded to this crisis of identity with a very specific poetic genre which combined the atmosphere of ‘country house poetry’ with references to both classical mythology and the Hungarian past.

This complex vision, in which he expressed his bitter criticism of contemporary mores, an idealization of the bellicose virtue of his forefathers, and a harking back to the myth of an ancient constitution, makes Berzsenyi an emblematic figure of the period. The poem, ‘To the Hungarians,’ a variation on motives found in the Roman poet Horace (*Carmina*, III. 6.) with its theme of the sins of the ancestors (“*delicta maiorum*”), can also be read as a reflection of the identity-discourse of the Hungarian middle nobility just before the unfolding of the Reform Age. It revisits the most crucial early modern *topoi* of identity in a highly pessimistic setting—contrasting the virtuous past with the corrupt present.

The poem is also representative of the integration of certain key elements of the early-modern ‘national’ discourse (such as the motif of ‘elect nationhood,’ and the post-humanist vision of *patria*) into the new cultural idiom of the ‘National Awakening.’ The poet concentrates on the problem of ‘corruption,’ deploring the deterioration of the moral and institutional cohesion of the body politic. Drawing on contemporary popular literature treating Hungarian history (such as István Losontzi’s textbook of 1773, *Hármas Kis-Tükör* – ‘Triple Small Mirror’), he devises a historical narrative, contrasting the “800 years of glory” of the ancient Hungarians, who were able to withstand the most dramatic historical vicissitudes as long as their virtue was intact, to the present Hungarians, who have forgotten their heroic past, have sunk into idleness, and set their personal interest over the call of patriotism. At the end of the poem this imagery of corruption becomes encapsulated in a ‘cosmic’ vision—with a reference to the rise and fall of ancient empires such

as Troy, Carthage, Rome, and Babylon—of the inconstancy of the goddess Fortuna, and the “iron fist of the Centuries,” which elevates all human creations to glory, only to destroy them ruthlessly in the end.

The key *topoi* of the poem, with its focus on the ancient virtue of the community of noblemen, are characteristic of the language of ‘classical republicanism.’ Importantly, however, Berzsenyi, by birth a member of the nobility of Western Hungary, which was traditionally loyal to Vienna, did not turn this in the direction of the anti-Habsburg version of the Hungarian identity-discourse cultivated by the Calvinists of Northeast Hungary and Transylvania. Instead, he described (for instance, in his poem, ‘To the rising nobility’, which was rhetorically the closest to his ‘To the Hungarians’) the ancient glory of the nation in terms of its unswerving loyalty to the—Habsburg—ruler.

As the poem survives in four different versions, it is possible to follow the shifts in Berzsenyi’s perspective, both in poetic and ideological terms. If we compare the first version, dating from before 1797, to the definitive one, there are some interesting omissions; for example, in verse 5 he eliminated the pejorative historical references to Ferenc Rákóczi II and Gábor Bethlen and replaced them with the more abstract allusion to “the murderous century of Zápolya,” thus muting the political and confessional edge of the poem, as these two figures were central to the Calvinist-Transylvanian historical canon. This might have been a step towards formulating a more unitary national referential system transcending previous internal divisions. He also omitted the detailed references to the decay of sexual morality, religious observance and military virtue—all central to the republican paradigm as well as to the Enlightenment genre of ‘philosophical poetry,’ a genre which was gradually becoming outdated as the imagery of corruption was becoming more metaphysical and less social. What takes the place of this moral invective is a series of references to a new vision of the nation. Instead of detailing the corruption of customs, Berzsenyi emphasizes the ‘de-nationalization’ of the Hungarians—a vision concentrated in the powerful symbols of the ‘forgetting’ of the national past and the abandonment of the national language.

Berzsenyi’s cultural-political narrative of Hungarianness encapsulated in this poem entered into a complex dialogue with the emerging ‘linguistic nationalism’ of the 1810–1820s. The catastrophic defeat of the noble insurrection against Napoleon in 1809 at Győr left him without illusions concerning the military power of the nobility. By 1811 he came to admit that the national project should be future-oriented rather than just perpetuating the ‘ancient

virtue' of the nobility: "I was looking for the way to express nationality, even though the nation itself might be already lacking." This was not incompatible with the ideology of the movement directed by Kazinczy, who tried to popularize the ideas of linguistic revival among the middle nobility as well. At the same time, his theoretical conflicts in the mid-1810s signaled a broader ideological shift away from the classical models and towards a mimetic competition with German cultural patterns. As a result, his peculiar synthesis of the language of classical republicanism with the national discourse of the nobility gave way to the cultivation—and reinvention—of folk traditions and the politics of incorporating the non-noble population into the symbolic framework of nationhood.

BT

To the Hungarians (I.)

Oh you, once mighty Hungary, gone to seed,
can you not see the blood of Árpád¹ go foul,
can you not see the mighty lashes
heaven has slapped on your dreary country?

Amidst the storms of eight blood-soaked centuries
the battered towers of Buda still stand aloft
although a thousand times, in anger,
you trod upon your own self, your own kin.

Your beastly morals scatter it all to dust –
a brood of vipers, venomous, hideous,
lay waste the castle which beheld the
hundreds of sieges it used to smile at.

You stood defiant even against the wild
Xerxes-like hordes of Outer-Mongolia;
you could resist even world-conquering Turkey's
mighty assault on the East and yonder;

¹ Árpád (? – 907?), chief of the Hungarian tribal confederation at the time of the conquest of the Carpathian basin, and ancestor of the first royal dynasty.

you did survive the murderous century
of Zápolya² – the secret assassins' hands –
while you stood firm amidst the flames of
family blood-feuds in retribution,

for you were led by virtues of yesteryear –
with Spartan arms you conquered throughout your wars;
wrestling you won, and Hercules-like
war-hammers shook in your steely fist-hold.

But now – you are gnawed by venomous, stealthy death.
Behold: the oak that proudly withstands the storm
that cannot break it from the North, but
vermin can chew up its mighty root-work

and then it's felled by only a flimsy breeze!
That's why the firm foundation of every land
must be morality untarnished
which, if destroyed, Rome will fall and founder.

What are Hungarians now?! Sybaritic wrecks –
they've ripped their splendid native insignia off
while, from their homeland's ravaged bulwarks,
building a palace as lair of leisure –

they shed their ancient mantle of champions;
forget their tongue; they're aping the strangers' talk;
they stomp the nation's Guardian Soul,³ and
foolishly worship a childish idol.

How diff'rent rang the thunder of Hungary
amidst the blood-soaked battles of Attila,
who boldly faced half of the world in
punitive anger against the foul West!

² István Szapolyai (or Zápolya), king of Hungary (1526–1540), elected by the anti-Habsburg faction of the nobility after the battle of Mohács. The power struggle between him and Ferdinand I Habsburg divided the country and contributed to the collapse of the unitary monarchy.

³ In the original version this line alludes to the 'national Genius.'

Árpád, our Chief, the founder of Hungary,
had braver troops to fight the Danubian shores,
how diff'rent were the swords of Hungary
Hunyadi⁴ used to repel the Sultan!

But woe – this is how everything perishes.
We bear the yoke of fickle vicissitudes;
the fairy mood of Luck has tossed us
playfully upward and down, while smiling.

The iron fist of centuries finishes
but all that man has built; gone is noble Troy;
gone are the might and pride of Carthage,
Babylon, Rome – they have all gone under.

Translated by Adam Makkai, in: Adam Makkai, ed., *In Quest of the 'Miracle Stag': The Poetry of Hungary*, Vol. 1. (Budapest: Tertia, 2000, 2nd edition), pp. 207–208.

⁴ János Hunyadi (c. 1407–1456), governor of Hungary during the infancy of king Ladislaus V, famous for his heroic struggle against the Ottomans, especially the defense of Belgrade in 1456.

JOSEPH VON HORMAYR: AUSTRIA AND GERMANY

Title: *Österreich und Deutschland* (Austria and Germany)

Originally published: Gotha, In der Beckerschen Buchhandlung, 1814

Language: German

Excerpts used are from Kurt Adel, ed., *Joseph Freiherr von Hormayr und die vaterländische Romantik in Österreich* (Wien: Bergland Verlag, 1969), pp. 132–135.

About the author

Joseph von Hormayr, Baron of Hortenbourg [1781, Innsbruck – 1848, Munich]: historian and publicist. He came from an old aristocratic family from Tyrol. Hormayr studied law in Innsbruck and began a career in administration. From 1799 to 1802, during the wars against revolutionary France, he served as a volunteer. Afterwards he moved to Vienna and worked in the Chancellery of State. After 1808, he was the director of the State and Imperial Archive, a position which enabled him to edit the *Archiv für Geschichte, Statistik, Literatur und Kunst* (Journal of History, Statistics, Literature and the Arts) between 1810 and 1837. Hormayr's loyalty to his native Tyrol shaped both his political activity and the historiographic interpretation of Austrian history he advocated in his writings. During the Napoleonic Wars (1804–1815), Tyrol was incorporated in the Kingdom of Bavaria. In 1809, with the support of Archduke Johann of Austria (1782–1859), the population of Tyrol revolted against the Bavarian and French authorities in the so-called 'Tyrolean Fight for Freedom.' Together with Andreas Hofer (1767–1810), Hormayr was one of the leaders of the Tyrolean uprising. In 1812 and 1813, Hormayr organized another Tyrolean movement against Napoleon known as the *Alpenbund*. When Metternich was informed about the movement he ordered the arrest of Hormayr and his collaborators (1813). Eventually, Tyrol reverted to Habsburg government in 1815. In 1828, Hormayr moved to the Bavarian court and became the Bavarian envoy in Hannover and later in Hamburg. In his late works, *Anemonen* (1845–1847) and especially in *Kaiser Franz und Metternich* (1848), Hormayr criticized the Metternich regime. In 1846, Hormayr returned to Munich where he died in 1848. During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Hormayr was referred to as one of the main representatives of documentary history, who nevertheless attempted to accommodate his vision of independent regional identity to the necessity of building a strong monarchy in Austria.

Main works: *Österreichischer Plutarch, oder Leben und Bildnisse aller Regenten und der berühmtesten Feldherren, Staatsmänner, Gelehrten und Künstler der österreichischen Kaiserstaates* [The Austrian Plutarch, or the lives and portraits of all regents and the most famous generals, statesmen, scholars and artists of the Austrian Empire] (1807–1814); *Taschenbuch über Vaterländische Geschichte* [Pocket-Book on national history] 18 vols., (1811–1848); *Österreich und Deutschland* [Austria and Germany] (1814); *Geschichte Andreas Hofers* [The history of Andreas Hofer] (1817) (also known as: *Das Land Tirol und der Tirolerkrieg*); *Wien, seine Geschichte und seine Denkwürdigkeiten* [Vienna, her history and memorabilia] 9 vols., (1822–1825); *Anemonen aus dem Tagebuch eines alten Pilgersmannes* [Anemones from the journal of an old pilgrim] (1845–47); *Kaiser Franz und Metternich* [Emperor Francis and Metternich] (1848).

Context

The theme of loyalty towards the House of Habsburg has been subject to many historiographic interpretations since the Middle Ages, as dynastic historiography was a well-established trend in Austria. Court historiographers generally devoted their studies to the family genealogy, legal questions and diplomacy as well as to the heraldry of the House of Habsburg. Hormayr combined his interest in dynastic topics with the new trends in critical historiography as exemplified by several authors in Austria at the end of the eighteenth century, such as Marquard Herrgott (1694–1762), Adrian Rauch (1731–1802), and Franz Kurz (1771–1843). Herrgott, the Benedictine historian and diplomat, published a much praised history of the Austrian Imperial family, *Genealogia diplomatica Augusta Gentis Habsburgicae* (1737), while Rauch synthesized much of the eighteenth-century developments in Austrian historiography in his *Österreichische Geschichte* (3 vols., 1779–1781). These authors established a critical historiographic apparatus based on large editions of sources they helped collect and edit.

In many respects, Hormayr belonged to this historiographic tradition. In a monumental work published between 1807 and 1814, *Österreichischer Plutarch*, he depicted the historical achievements of Austria as some of the most remarkable in European history. Hormayr followed the main tenets of dynastic historiography and presented the accomplishments of former monarchs as meaningful examples of patriotic values. Considering the political situation in Austria during the Napoleonic Wars, Hormayr's task was to convince the Austrians of the danger of revolutionary change and the integrity as well as necessity of the monarchy. It was the historical mission of nobility and the monarchy, destroyed by the French Revolution, which Hormayr hoped to restore by writing about aristocratic and royal principles.

The journals Hormayr edited from 1808 and 1810, respectively, namely, *Vaterländische Blätter für den österreichischen Kaiserstaat* and *Archiv für Geographie, Historie, Staats- und Kriegskunst*, inaugurated a new phase in Hormayr's writing. The creation of a national history complemented the love of national language and the establishment of a national literature. The general intellectual debates in Vienna at the time centered on the issue of national literature, which was not only seen as 'German' but also as elevating Austria to a leading role in the anti-Napoleonic movement. The ideas of Friedrich von Schlegel (1772–1829), who moved to Vienna in 1808 and joined the Austrian Foreign Office, also served to cement the ideological foundation for the 'national liberation' from Napoleon's armies in Austria.

Hormayr synthesized many of these ideas in *Österreich und Deutschland* (1814). Three main ideas dominate Hormayr's interpretation of Austria's destiny in European history: the conviction that 'History,' an independent and objective judge, could serve as a guide through the difficulty of present times; the importance of Austria in European history, whose role had always been to protect its very diverse nations from successive oppressions; and, finally, devotion to the ruling house. In addition to praising Austria's role in preserving the balance of power in Central Europe and restoring the pre-Napoleonic status quo, Hormayr also recognized the fact that the Empire was composed of a variety of languages and peoples. This made Austria unique and, also, contributed to its specific historical evolution. Hormayr emphasised the plurality of social, political and cultural traditions characterizing the Austrian Empire, assuming that regional identities and different historical traditions complemented each other in supporting the House of Habsburg. Drawing on the experience of the 'Tyrolean Fight for Freedom' that shaped his perspective on the intertwining of regionalism and loyalty towards the House of Habsburg, Hormayr put special emphasis on regional traditions, devising a specific sort of dynastical patriotism.

A new modality of Romantic historiography emerged during the 'Vormärz' era in Austria. The proponents of this new orientation considered history as shaping the civic and patriotic consciousness of the citizens. One major question animated these debates on Austria's role in a transformed Central Europe: how to orient the national identification of various regional groups towards an encompassing Austrian identity. Hormayr attempted to combine a variant of the supra-national '*Reichspatriotismus*' ('Imperial patriotism') with the existence of ethnic and language variety in Austria, and was willing to cultivate these regional traditions as long as they remained confined within

the realm of cultural revival and did not seek secession from Austria. While various regionalisms centered exclusively on '*Heimat*' (homeland) and '*Land*,' his historiographic model was a compromise between regional and national identity, as it became more strongly oriented towards an inclusive model of the history of the German people and nation in Austria. Ultimately, his attempts to formulate a supra-ethnic, state-based Austrian identity presupposed a natural German cultural predominance. At the same time, his vision of Austria's historical mission went against those projects of German unification which challenged the position of the Habsburgs.

Hormayr's idea of regional identity functioned on three argumentative levels. First, that the local '*Heimat*' was an experiential realm which provided a matrix for perception and memory in social and political life; secondly, that the celebration of local and regional particularity compensated for the levelling effects of the Josephist reforms, namely, centralization; and, thirdly, that these mediating and compensatory functions required that the image of the '*Heimat*' be reduced and altered for the purposes of national integration. In addition to his arguments about the equal respect for the ethnic groups of the Empire and the importance of the Austrian Empire for European stability, these argumentative levels fashioned the discussion about national identity during the '*Vormärz*' era. It was, however, during the revolution of 1848 that they were integrated into discussions on patriotism and nationalism, which came to dominate political thinking in nineteenth-century Austria.

MT

Austria and Germany

History, that pure two-sided mirror of judgements past and judgements still to come, that inexhaustible source of universally beneficial experience, and incorruptible judge of those who have no other judge, illumines the darkest and direst storm with a faith, forged by her mighty lightning-bolts, in a higher providence that guides our destinies. The design of providence is as unexplored as the ancient foundations of the Earth itself, just as we know not why is iron attracted to a magnet. The sibylline pages where once it was inscribed are gone with the wind. The way she moves is also cloaked in mystery; yet here and there her colossal footprint speaks all too clearly, and let mere mortal eyes guess—but only guess—at the truth. For who, seeking to behold her, does not fear the same punish-

ment as befell the insolent miscreant who tore the veil from the image in the temple of Sais?¹

So be it! He who has ears to hear, let him hear!

Austria: frequently misjudged, never threatening with her might, but expending it in bloody conflicts for other, holy and always just causes; a brave frontier guard against Hun, [Great] Moravian, Magyar, Mongol and Turk, against the hordes from the East and the North, and against the ceaseless schemes of the West to bring back the power of Charlemagne; oft-times saviour of Germany's liberty, yet never a danger to that of Italy; ancient ally of the guardians of the Gotthard and the icy bastions of Gemmi and the Jungfrau; this Austria has been directed by the hand of destiny to be an intermediary, and as such has survived—and must continue to survive—the most terrible of tempests, as the foundation, the keystone, the precondition of a good (or at least tolerable) state in the European body politic, which is unthinkable without equilibrium on the one hand and, on the other, that liberty in which the smaller, weaker and less stable nations feel their possessions to be safe from more powerful neighbors, and treaties count for more than sand cast in the enemy's eye until military preparations are complete and the time is ripe! Austria as a political entity evolved over a period of six-and-a-half centuries, in which the various constituent parts that make up her present extent came together through all manner of accidents: as fiefdoms reverting to the Empire, as inheritance, as lands impounded, exchanged or ceded, and most of all through marriage.

No other European empire can number so many nations, languages, constitutions and different ways of life. How much closer is the Norman to the Provençal, or the Andalusian to the Catalanian, than is the German to the Magyar or the Slovak? We are not surrounded by natural confines comparable to the frontiers of other empires—the Ocean, the Alps, the Pyrenees and the Rhine! Such was the will of Providence. She put us in a position that necessitated a constant struggle to overcome these disadvantageous differences—a struggle for both internal unity (but not uniformity) and external unity, waged in the noblest rivalry between our multifarious tribes and tongues. She placed us in the middle, at the crossroads of nations between two colossi, to the West and to the North, because (as a wise man once said) “it is in conflict that great men show their most brilliant qualities; the common people, as well as literature and the arts, have always been at their most

¹ At the temple of the Egyptian Goddess Neith in Sais, Plutarch reports the inscription: “No mortal has yet been able to lift the veil that covers me.”

splendid in times of strife between nations! In the bustling theatre of ever-changing world events, to stand still is to lag behind! A river that does not flow soon turns to ice or silt. Where there is light and warmth, there alone is life!”

This unceasing reciprocal action, this constantly refreshing ebb and flow, this give and take reminiscent of the tenderness of old age and infancy, is vividly evoked in the words of Hermocrates of Syracuse² to Gelo—a speech repeated often but in vain: “There is no disgrace in connections giving way to one another, a Dorian to a Dorian, or a Chalcidian to his brethren; above and beyond this we are neighbors, live in the same country, are girt by the same sea, and go by the same name. [...] But the foreign invader will always find us united against him, since the hurt of one is the danger of all.”

Unity among all these differences, however, is and has always been represented only by the ruling house, by a house richer than any other in noble and virtuous princes versed in the arts of war and peace—in rulers whose supreme power has been tested by their deeds and sufferings:

And that high royalty was ne’er pluck’d off,
The faiths of men ne’er stained with revolt;
Fresh expectation troubled not the land
With any long’d-for change or better state.³

and “in whose breast (as was said of an ancient king) justice, driven out from every corner of the earth, has found a safe refuge!”

Just as, within the system of European equilibrium, the existence and prosperity of the Austrian monarchy is necessary for the liberty of all, so is the blessed longevity of the ruling dynasty, as the sole binding element of that mighty existence and prosperity, necessary for its unity!

Translated by Robert Russell

² Sicilian statesman (fifth century BC), opposed to the colonizing efforts of Athens.

³ Shakespeare, *King John*. [IV.2.]

JOACHIM LELEWEL: LEGITIMACY OF THE POLISH NATION

Title: *Prawność narodu polskiego* (Legitimacy of the Polish nation)

Originally published: “Legitimität der Polnischen Nation,” and “Légitimité de la nation polonaise,” in *Jeune Suisse* no. 88, 30 April 1836; *Prawność narodu polskiego*, in *Naród Polski* (Paris) 1836, pp. 74–83 (anonymously)

Language: Polish

The excerpts used are from the modern Polish edition: Andrzej Walicki and Jan Garewicz, eds., *700 lat myśli polskiej: Filozofia i myśl społeczna w latach 1831–1864* (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1977), pp. 792–798.

About the author

Joachim Lelewel [1786, Warsaw – 1861, Paris]: historian. Lelewel came from a family of Polonized gentry from East Prussia. He studied in Wilno (Vilnius, present-day Lithuania), where he returned after several years of an academic career in Warsaw and Krzemieniec (Kremenets, present-day Ukraine). The liberal atmosphere of the 1820s influenced the administration of Wilno district, with its Polish educational system under the direction of Adam Jerzy Czartoryski (1770–1861). Lelewel taught history to a cohort of innovative and rebellious students (among others, **Adam Mickiewicz**), who in some respects tended to oppose the philosophy and science of the Enlightenment, which the majority of Wilno’s academic establishment adhered to. Lelewel also worked on ancient Polish history, published historical sources and sought to devise a democratic ‘philosophy of history’ of the Polish nation. In his historical writings Lelewel did not restrict his interests to the history of Poland but built wide comparisons (for instance, a comparative analysis of Polish and Spanish historical developments) and dealt with ancient and universal history as well. During his work in Wilno he was influenced by the Göttingen historical school (as a student of Gottfried E. Groddeck) but his later writings are much closer to the French ‘democratic’ historiography (e.g., Jules Michelet). Lelewel rejected the assumptions of the previous generation of Polish historians who criticized the tradition of noble republicanism from the perspective of the Enlightenment. In contrast, he emphasized the practical and ideological virtues of the *Rzeczpospolita* tradition, which he considered a repository of democratic ideas. Along these lines he also advocated the emancipation of the peasantry as a return to ‘ancient splendor’ and joined the radical circles of the revolutionary intelligentsia. During the November Uprising (1830–1831) Lele-

wel, who had been a member of Parliament in the 'Congress Kingdom' since 1828, became a member of the National Government, and after the defeat of the uprising he emigrated to France and later to Belgium. He was one of the leaders of the moderate democrats, dividing his time between historical works and attempts to unify various streams among the Polish émigrés. To his death, the 'recluse of Brussels' was an authority for Polish and European democrats.

Main works: *Historyka* [Methodology of history] (1815); *Bibliograficznych ksiąg dwoje* [Two books of bibliography] (1823–1826); *Dzieje Polski...potocznym sposobem opowiedział...* [A history of Poland in common parlance] (1829); *Nowosilcow w Wilnie w roku szkolnym 1823/4* [Novosilcov in Wilno in the academic year 1823/4] (1831); *Numismatique du Moyen-Âge*, 3 vols., (1835); *Porównanie dwu powstań polskich, 1794 i 1830–1831* [Comparison of two Polish insurrections: 1794 and 1830–31] (1840); *Polska wieków średnich* [Poland of the Middle Ages] (1846–1851) 4 vols., *Stracone obywatelstwo stanu kmieckiego w Polsce* [The lost civil rights of the third estate in Poland] (1846); *Polska, dzieje i rzeczy jej* [Poland, her history and affairs] 20 vols., (1855–1868).

Context

The Polish post-1831 diaspora was deeply divided along the lines of political sympathies. The leader of the National Government from the times of the November Uprising, Adam Czartoryski, led its conservative-liberal wing. His group, known as Hôtel Lambert (from his Paris residence), put forward an ambitious foreign policy of the non-existing state, sponsored Polish cultural and scientific societies and tried to compete with Russia in its Balkan politics (see also **Ilja Garašanin**, *The draft*). On the extreme left of the Polish diaspora, radicals speculated about a classless society.

Lelewel was perceived as the main representative of the moderate left—democratic and egalitarian, but not socialist. In his emigration writings he sought to advocate the Polish cause in Western Europe after the defeat of the November Uprising. He sought to encourage patriotic efforts while trying to minimize internal conflicts between various streams of democrats. He believed that the best Polish democratic political program was to return to the principles of *Rzeczpospolita*, rather than demanding radical social changes based on any utopian model. Lelewel considered the political culture of the Polish gentry eminently democratic. For him it was another incarnation of ancient Slav democracy, earlier destroyed by the fatal influence of Western feudalism. In Lelewel's interpretation, the primary cause of the partitions was the betrayal of the principle of equality and the subordination of the peasantry to the gentry. Nevertheless, he stressed the privileged position of the Polish peasantry in comparison to feudal Western Europe.

The 'Legitimacy of the Polish nation,' an appeal to foreigners as well as to Polish émigrés, summarized Lelewel's philosophy of history and his political project. It focused on the idea of Polish independence. According to Lelewel, Poland derived its right to exist from the right of nations and also from its extraordinary and honorable political tradition. Poland had been the most democratic country, and thus the restoration of its independence should have been the main aim of the European democratic movement.

Overall, Lelewel's philosophy of history and his political ideas were crucial for Polish Romanticism. His ideas were particularly discussed during the struggle of the young romantics against the older generation of scholars formed by the Enlightenment and particularly after the defeat of the January uprising in 1863–1864, when a new generation of ideologists entered the political scene who rejected the democratic belief in the brotherhood of all nations, the hope for a successful military insurrection and the tradition of *liberum veto* (see **Józef Szujski**, *Some truths from our history*).

While Lelewel's philosophy of history and political ideas had a powerful impact on the Polish political discourse of the first half of the nineteenth century, with the advent of positivism, his democratic interpretation of history began to lose its persuasive power. His impact on Polish literature was even more evident than his influence on historiography. Both of the most important Polish romantic poets, **Adam Mickiewicz** and Juliusz Słowacki (1809–1849), were deeply influenced by Lelewel and reiterated his thesis of ancient Slav democracy. While in the 1860s the conservative historians from Cracow rejected both his historical and political ideas, the so-called Warsaw historical school (Władysław Smoleński, Tadeusz Korzon) revived his democratic interpretation of history. After 1945, Lelewel became a problematic source of 'progressive values' for Polish Marxist historiography. He was seen in a favorable light as a friend of Marx and Engels, and as one of the democratic opponents of the Holy Alliance. But his own ideology differed seriously from Marxism. Thus, in the editions of his writings from the 1950s, passages which did not correspond to current political needs were usually cut out. After the demise of Stalinism his reception became restricted to historiography proper.

MG

Legitimacy of the Polish nation

There is no doubt that every nation and every country has an undeniable right to free and unconstrained self-government. However, in the course of events history endows nations with different customs, prejudices and prefer-

ences; various nationalities, demands and needs; differing rights, obligations, confusion of visions and interests, so that this fundamental right of social relations is interpreted differently, sometimes in bizarre, perverted and frightful ways.

We live in an age of revolution which has sunk such bizarrely deformed rights into the abyss of destruction, although many of them use every opportunity to escape its pit and, rising from the dead, grow in new strength. Since the decline of Napoleon, in the process of aligning the past with the future and the ruin of bygone centuries with the unpredictable visions of tomorrow, the issue of rights and legality has been on everyone's lips. And there have been many rights which have become the subject of conflicts between nations; in these clashes the rights of some nations were sacrificed for the rights of others that we shall call political, diplomatic, or egotistic nations.

The Polish nation also used to have its rights, which were discussed and which together with the rights of other nations were sacrificed to satisfy the appetites of mighty thieves and villains. The partition diplomacy of 1807 and 1809 plundered the country anew, sanctioning the previous division and avoiding addressing the fundamental rights of the Polish nation, and hence it certified that this nation's rights were violated, and therefore it also confirmed that they did indeed exist. What were these rights?

One of them, similarly to almost all other nations, was language. The Poland of the past spoke three languages: Lithuanian, Ruthenian and Polish. The Lithuanian language, common among the inhabitants of the lower lands along the Niemen¹ and the Dźwina², appears in folk songs, rituals and translations of the Bible. The Ruthenian language³ appears in all these, as well as in church disputes, in chronicles and statutes, in legal discourse, and in pastoral poetry. Finally, Polish, the most refined of all Slav languages, dominates not only in the legal, political, social, religious, ecclesiastic, chronicle and historical discourses, but also in poetry and science.

Language is a precious national possession, and all Slav nations should cultivate it with devotion, for it expresses their thoughts and ideas. Let foreigners know that as I search the vocabulary of these languages, I cannot find anywhere—either in Polish or in any other Slav dialect—a word that denotes

¹ Present-day Nemunas.

² Dvina.

³ One should distinguish between the Ruthenian and Russian languages. The latter is the Moscow dialect which originated from the area of the Volga river in the land of Ugrians, who are not Slavs. [Author's footnote]

despotism. Allegedly, the first language to have an equivalent of despotism was Russian, where the word used has been *samoderzhtsy* [independent in power], along with the foreign 'autocracy,' 'tsar,' and 'emperor.' For 'autocrat' and 'monarch' the Polish language (and probably other Slav languages as well) has adopted the translations 'samowładca' [independent ruler] and 'jednowładca' [single ruler], whose meaning, however, is not easily assimilated. In contrast, all terms referring to dignities and posts are etymologically linked to words designating free district and community activities. These are terms and rights characteristic of the Polish nation, but brutally disfigured in the land where the waters of the Volga and Neva run.⁴

For many nations, the principal right is the right to form a society and social classes. For the Circassians and the Abkhaz, for instance, mere cut-throat plundering in the Caucasian mountains suffices; the Dutch establish their society on exchange trade and transfer; the Kalmucks and Tatars tramp the steppes with their caravans and livestock; other European nations excel in industry, intellectual activity, art and entertainment. Without these activities the nations would not exist, for they are the perpetuating force of the nations' social life. If we examine Polish history we shall not find any of these activities. [...] The only force which has constituted the social life of the Polish nation has always been political activity. It is the life of its citizens, the nation's political life that remains the most important issue and the sole subject of Polish history; all other social activity is merely an addition—a purely ornamental supplement. For this reason, the history of the Polish nation should be of particular interest to all. Yet, the foreign nations hold it in terrible disregard.

The history of Poland prompts a conclusion that the issues of its legal system and sovereignty are inseparable from the institutions which instigate the nation's involvement in the country's social life. This was well understood by the diplomacy that decided upon this legal system; as soon as there appeared a chance of creating the entity of the Polish state, there always emerged people's movements, and they were very active whether in the times of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, of the Kingdom created at the Congress in Vienna, or of the Poznań County. Although their institutions were the fruit of foreign seed, they managed to grow on the tormented trunk of Polish history, sprouting new leaves of local legitimacy.

⁴ It is worth noting that the Moscow dialect—Russian—has not had until very recently any words to designate 'justice' and 'virtue.' They appear only in scientific language. (Also, there are no words for 'freedom' and 'nation.') [Author's footnote]

Not to tire my readers with a detailed description of the popular aspect of Polish laws, I shall only turn to the example of the ministers in the past Republic, who despite their power and privileges remained primarily the servants of the nation. In the Napoleonic era, the constitutions of French origin placed ministers above the houses of parliament, and the same was true for the constitution of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw. However, the ministers never dared to use this privilege because it seemed discordant with the tradition of Polish lawfulness. [...]

Is there still anyone in France who would like to see the representatives of the *tiers état* kneeling in parliament as they used to? This is one of the historical laws that the nation rebelled against in 1788. In Poland we have had no such laws—when centuries ago the representatives of the bourgeoisie were forced to leave a parliamentary session, it was not for such a reason, but because they did not want to accept the Polish land laws.⁵ Moreover, when in 1790 they were called to a brotherly participation in sessions, and when in 1807 they sat down together in equality, there were no degrading laws to clarify or reject.

If I compare the French to the old Polish tradition, I do not mean to offend the French; I only use this comparison to rephrase the recent argument of their public opinion, which knows how to evaluate such laws. Yet, what can I say about the laws that force the nation's representatives armed with legislative powers, on entering the parliament, to take an oath to the king and the constitution, which they have the power to alter? This kind of oath calls into doubt their being a nation's representatives, degrades the dignity of their function, stigmatizes them as enslaved servants; what can I say about the laws that force to abandon the religious formula which, devoid of its eminence, is a useless calling of the divine name insulting common sense? In the past, Poland did not entertain any laws of this kind; it had no knowledge of them, to the extent that, when establishing the 1807 and 1815 constitutions, it did not even consider implementing such abnormalities.

These laws are a burden to the nation, from which it cannot free itself and against which its greatest minds protest. Likewise, the legal systems of many other nations are still dynastic. Portugal and Spain are engaged in a tiresome battle over the laws and interests of the dynasty; in France the air rings with

⁵ Polish cities inside the Republic had separate laws German, or other foreign laws—which were in conflict with the local land laws, that is, state laws. This was a source of constant clashes which proved harmful for the country by bringing about the decay of the cities. [Author's footnote]

conflicts about dynastic issues between legitimists and quasi-legitimists, while in the meantime the people suffer! And as they suffer they create laws by themselves, and themselves guard them. Take the example of the Basques: they put their freedom above the law of the dynasty, for which they kill each other! As a result, their existence is halted for the time being. Poland did not preserve any laws of this kind.

One may oppose this to the image of the Holy Mother, devotedly elevated by the people to the Polish throne; not in order to celebrate civic achievements, but in order to stamp medals to honour her, conduct holy pilgrimages, and sometimes even coronations. Yes, it was the Mother of God that Poland and Hungary chose as their queen, and it was Her coronations that they celebrated. Poland's invaders usurped the rituals and the name Virgin Mary from one of the crowns, and tore the Patroness' robe. Free peoples feeling their potency elevate themselves into heavenly heights. In ancient Athens, Jupiter was the king and no one was allowed to mention any other before him. Minerva was a patroness there. In ancient Rome Jupiter kept an eye on the entire country and its people. In Poland this role belongs to the Holy Mother of Christ. Her immaculate motherly protection is far better than that of heirs and heiresses of dynasties, or than the untrue and poisonous tales of terrestrial omnipotence and irresponsible inevitability.

Poland used to be a republic which elected its commander for life, giving him the title of king. Each elector was at the same time a candidate, with no exceptions in terms of material status or the occupied post; loyalty and equality were the only warranties of dynasties and titles. The potency of the people manifested itself in all branches of the country's system; the independent judicial and representative branches, as well as the administrative were all composed of the nation's members; their function was to pass the laws. It is the right of Poland and the Polish people—when they rightfully demand their land and independence to be returned—to legally establish their republican principles; this is the heritage of their ancestors that can still be retrieved. Their request is not born out of some new fancy but out of an eternal and rightly deserved law. Who would dare to deny them this right? What man born into this nation could negate this tradition?

I can hear the lamentations of the betrayers of national rights, who claim that these republican laws not only led Poland to ruin in the past but also stand in the way of the country's rebuilding. This is because the neighbors who hold a grudge against Poland, who destroyed her and now prevent her laws from being resurrected, obey different principles, and therefore diplomatically reason that if Poland is to be raised from the dead its republican

rules must be forgotten. In support of this reasoning they give examples of those nations that surrender their rights and renounce their centuries-old monarchies, exchanging them for others in the name of their countries' well-being. Why, their argument goes, should Poland not surrender her republican rights as well? Why should she not adopt the new laws that political wisdom dictates? Oh, you worshippers of hypocrisy, servants of dishonesty! How sophisticated the attire of your egotism! For your own profit you have torn the insides of your native land, and by tarnishing its centuries-old principles, the principles of its people, you have weakened it and eventually put it to death. You still hold the mutilating sword you used then, and sharpen its edge in foreign, corrupted forces. You want to create the magnate status, the inherited dignity of peers, the right of primogeniture, and privileges foreign to the Polish law; to preserve insignia of rank, the titles gained illegally or in foreign service, usually in service of Poland's enemies. You want a Poland in which you could gain the greatest profits while taking pleasure in humiliating the people and preserving their servitude and slavery.

I can also hear other nations' republican voices who reproachfully say that nothing can be gained from the rights of the old Poland, because like the rights of the ancient Greek system these were only a property of the privileged few—the designated gentry—while the rest of the society was devoid of rights and freedom. Is it these rights, they ask, that Poland wants to have regained? This reproach is easiest to refute; one needs only to unveil one more law of the Polish nation and explain it.

In Poland, the Negro trade has always been unknown, while the Western peasant who was not free carried the humiliating servant name *serf*. As the Polish genius deplored this degrading custom they began to call him the dependant, the *sujet*. Hence the conclusion that the exploitation of the people was not supported by our law but by extremely corrupt practices. The decaying republic did not free its citizens, but in the Great Diet it proclaimed freedom for all People living on Polish soil, and in its final moments passed to its heirs the responsibility to put this proclamation into life. It is this national law closely connected with republican principles that terrifies the aristocrats.

If we assume that some force prevents Poland from regaining its independence and land as well as from restating and declaring its republican laws, it must be the same evil force that casts obstacles on its way to apply these rights equally to everyone. The requests to return this nation's rightfully deserved equality have been formulated in a variety of ways. The constitution of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw declared that all citizens are equal in law.

This constitution was kept in the Napoleonic spirit, so it preserved the gentry's privileges and did not deny its rights, but at the same time it made the gentry equal with others, so that a peasant had the same civil and political rights as a member of the gentry.

In the Congress Kingdom, the constitution of 1815 re-formulated and weakened many of its predecessor's statements, but it has never denied its laws entirely. In some districts, the number of peasants among the electors allowed to exercise their political rights rose significantly. From Polish gubernias, [among them] regional councils in Wilno, demands were coming to Tsar Alexander to free the people. During the last Samogitian and Ukrainian uprisings numerous citizens [noblemen] returned freedom to the peasants—it seems that the rule of equality was extended to all people.

It is evident, therefore, that the idea of equality of republican rights for all people, regardless of their status, should be acknowledged as the right of the Polish nation, inherited after the old Republic, and in accordance with the course of humanity's progress. The institutions it establishes in today's young Poland, the resurrecting Poland, have been polished for centuries of history and, harmonious with the past, they can be the foundation for constructing a new constitution. The latter is the legality that is demanded by the Polish nation, as well as by other sovereignty-seeking peoples who want to place it among other rights such as the right to independence, to popular rule, and republican principles.

While other nations are bound to first dispose of the burden of old laws and start building new ones from scratch, the Polish nation ought to find and develop the laws that already exist in its history, to avoid regulations that are contradictory, and reject invented or enforced ones. The men of Polish soil can be proud of the passed on to them by the country's history, and of the high post that it had furnished for them; this is a calling which they are obliged to answer with dignity. Shame on a man who dares to offend these laws.

Translated by Zuzanna Ładyga

MIHAIL KOGĂLNICEANU: SPEECH FOR THE OPENING OF THE COURSE ON NATIONAL HISTORY

Title: *Cuvânt pentru deschiderea cursului de istorie națională în Academia Mihăileană* (Speech for the opening of the course on national history, delivered at the Mihăileană Academy)

Originally published: Originally published as a brochure in Iași (1843), then in the journal *Propășirea* (Iași), 24 September and 1 October, 1844

Language: Romanian

The excerpts used are from Mihail Kogălniceanu, *Opere*, vol. II., ed. by Alexandru Zub (Bucharest: Ed. Academiei, 1976), pp. 386–389, 393.

About the author

Mihail Kogălniceanu [1817, Iași – 1891, Paris]: historian, politician, and publicist. He was the scion of an old *răzeș* (free-peasantry) family, and his father held several important administrative positions at the Court of Moldavia. In 1828, under the patronage of Prince Mihail Sturdza (r. 1834–1849), and together with Vasile Alecsandri (1818–1890), one of the most popular Romanian poets of the nineteenth century, he was sent to study at Lunéville and Berlin, where he met Alexander von Humboldt (1769–1859) and became acquainted with the works of Leopold von Ranke (1795–1886). In 1838 he returned to Moldavia. In 1840 he started editing *Dacia Literară* (Literary Dacia) and from 1841 *Arhiva românească* (Romanian Archive). In 1844 he inaugurated the first course on national history at the ‘Mihăileană Academy’ in Iași (founded in 1835) and edited the journal *Propășirea* (Advancement). During the revolutionary activities in Moldavia in March 1848, he was forced to leave the country. In exile, he wrote ‘The Wishes of the National Party in Moldavia,’ one of the most important documents of the Revolution of 1848 in the Danubian Principalities. He also published a ‘Project for a Moldovan Constitution.’ Between 1850 and 1859 he was an active ‘Unionist.’ In 1859 the Assemblies of Moldavia and Wallachia elected Prince Alexandru Ioan Cuza (r. 1859–1866) as the common ruler of both countries, thus creating the United Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia. Kogălniceanu played an important role in the period that followed the unification. In 1862 he delivered an important speech on the land reform in the Romanian parliament, which was followed in 1864 by its enactment as law. After the abdication of Cuza in 1866, Kogălniceanu remained active in politics. In 1868 he became a member of the Romanian Academy. In 1877 he was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs. On 9 May 1877 Kogălniceanu proclaimed the independence of Romania in the Romanian parliament, which was acknowledged after the Russian-Turkish War

(1877–1878), by the treaties of San Stefano and Berlin (1878). As a politician, orator, and a cultural leader, Kogălniceanu played an important role in the development of modern Romania. He was not only a leading politician, but also an active historian, collecting and editing a vast amount of historical sources. His historical studies served as foundations for the establishment of a national historiography in Romania, and were incorporated both by nationalist (B. P. Hașdeu, **Nicolae Iorga**) and critical (D. Onciul, C. Giurescu) schools of Romanian historiography. In political terms, Kogălniceanu was mostly appropriated by the liberal tradition, but he became a reference in many nationalist programs as well.

Main works: *Histoire de la Valachie, de la Moldavie et des Valaques Transdanubiens* (1837); *Esquisse sur l'histoire, les mœurs et la langue des cigains, connus en France sous le nom de Bohémiens* (1837), *Despre civilizație* [On civilization] (1845); *Cuvînt pentru deschiderea cursului de istorie națională rostit la Academia Mihăileană* [Speech for the opening of the course on national history, delivered at the Mihăileană Academy] (1843); *Letopisețele Țării Moldovei* [The Chronicles of Moldavia], 3 vols. (1845–1852).

Context

The period preceding the Revolution of 1848 was marked in the Danubian Principalities (Moldavia and Wallachia) by profound transformations. When the war of Greek independence ended with the Treaty of Adrianople in 1829, Russia secured important provisions for Moldavia and Wallachia. The ‘Divans’ (councils of boyars) became part of the administration, and the princes were now elected by the boyars for a fixed term of seven years. The ‘Divans’ were also commissioned to draw up new constitutions for Wallachia and Moldavia. In 1831 and 1832 *Regulamentele Organice* (Organic Statutes) were introduced by the Russian occupation (1828–1834), and these sets of legislative acts served as the countries’ first modern constitutions. This tendency towards modernization was visible not only in social and economic regulations but also in the emergence of a new social group which favored progress and development. It became customary for the sons of the new political and economic élite to go abroad to study in Western Europe, especially in France. Russian officers spoke French and introduced French culture during their occupation. Romanians identified with France as another civilization with Latin roots, and were deeply impressed by the French Revolution and the campaigns of Napoleon. Nationalism was among the ideas spread by revolutionary France which greatly captivated the Romanian students. In the 1820s and 1830s they identified with insurgent peoples like the Italians and the Poles, and manufactured similar revolutionary scenarios for their own countries. In turn, public opinion in France became increasingly aware of the claims of national liberation made by Romanian nationalists. The interna-

tional campaign for the 'Romanian cause' also benefited from the improved domestic situation. After the withdrawal of the Russian armies in 1834, the internal situation of the Danubian Principalities stabilized. In 1846 a customs union was introduced between Moldavia and Wallachia, which laid the foundations of a unified market.

This new generation of Romanian intellectuals argued that in order to create a strong and independent Romanian state two conditions needed to be fulfilled: the internal consolidation of society, by which they meant social and economic reforms, and the creation of a Romanian high culture. If the former objective was assumed to have commenced with the Revolution of 1821 and the restoration of the autochthonous princes, the latter was still in its infancy. Under the spell of Romantic ideas, Romanian intellectuals looked at their native tradition and assumed to have found in the Romanian peasants the necessary ingredients for the construction of a national culture. Codifying and recording the historical memory of the people became as important to the progress of society as the introduction of economic and social reforms. History was portrayed as a truly universal science, the repository of the values of mankind. The creation of a national history was part of the process of creating a national state. Finally, history was seen as shaping the national spirit and culture, and no nation could claim individual existence without an understanding of the past.

Paradigmatic for the complex interplay of 'national traditions' in nineteenth-century intellectual history in Eastern-Europe, Kogălniceanu's argument about the relationship between historical development and state-formation was largely based on the 'Preface' to *История государства Руссiйского* (History of the Russian State) by the Russian historian, Nikolai Mikhailovich Karamzin (1766–1826). At the same time, he applied Karamzin's ideas on the use of history to the Romanian context. A national history, Kogălniceanu believed, was the only way to glorify the heroic past of the Romanians and show them the path towards a prosperous future.

Two issues preoccupied the authors dealing with the past of the Romanians: historical origins and the glorious conduct of medieval rulers. Without diminishing the importance of these issues for the historical memory of the nation, Kogălniceanu, nevertheless, proposed a different methodology. The nineteenth-century debate about historical origins was not simply a debate about historical sources. It was also about the basis of social order, the source of national character, and the value of civilization. Most of all, the question of origins was one of the most important tasks assigned to the newly emerging discipline of national history. In the late 1840s the predominant answer to

this question remained the 'Latinist' one elaborated by the 'Transylvanian School', which affirmed the 'pure' Latin origin of the Romanians. Repudiating the exaggerated views on the Latin origins of the Romanians, Kogălniceanu followed in the tradition of **Naum Râmniceanu** and argued that, apart from the Romans, the Dacians too played an important part in Romanian ethno-genesis.

In addition to criticizing the excessive Latinism of some of his contemporaries, Kogălniceanu also suggested that national history should not deal exclusively with the 'medieval glory' of the Romanian voivodes. In this respect, Kogălniceanu offered a 'democratic' interpretation of the national past: he believed in constitutional government and civil liberties. His 'democratism' was not, however, individualistic; instead it gave precedence to the nation over the individual. A national history should include a narrative about the 'people,' deemed the source of national consciousness and independence. Kogălniceanu considered that general principles relating to development of history were revealed in the activity and the life of the common people. In this context, the role of the historian was paramount. More than politicians, poets and philosophers, historians—Kogălniceanu argued—were the ones who could connect the past, present and future of the nation in a narrative continuum; they were those who delineated the destiny of the nation.

Each nation, Kogălniceanu believed, had a historical mission. To narrate that mission, national historiography needed to be based on moral principles. European history was seen as the sum of national histories, with the history of the Romanians being a part of the broader European history. Moreover, Kogălniceanu suggested, the Romanians should be familiar with European history and should learn from the experience of other nations. Accordingly, he offered his course on the history of the Romanian nation with the purpose of familiarizing the Romanian public with contemporary Western developments. At the same time, he signaled the importance of the Romanian contribution to European history. If the task of history was to offer guidance for the present and models to emulate in the future, then the study of the past should not be based on nationalist passions but should aim simply at revealing the truth.

The relationship between history and the idea of the nation became intricately connected in Romanian political discourse after the revolution of 1848. Kogălniceanu's programmatic declaration about national history not only marked the beginning of modern Romanian historiography, it also served as guidance to many ideological movements in late nineteenth- and

early twentieth-century Romania. During the communist era, Kogălniceanu's writings were largely neglected, but there were some attempts to critically evaluate his contribution to Romanian and European historiography, as illustrated by Alexandru Zub's *Mihail Kogălniceanu istoric* (Mihail Kogălniceanu, the historian) (1974).

MT

**Speech for the opening of the course on national history,
delivered at the Mihăileană Academy**

After the contemplation of the world, after the wonders of nature, nothing is more interesting, more noble or more worthy of our attention than History.

History, gentlemen,—as has been said by some of the most famous authors—is the truthful account and presentation of the accomplishments of humankind; it is the result of ages and experiences. Therefore, it can rightfully be called the voice of peoples who had once been and the icon of past times. Karamzin calls [history] the testament left by ancestors to their grandchildren, to serve them as an interpretation of the present time and as advice for the future. In such an important respect history has to be, and has always been, the most important book of peoples and of each person individually; for each rank, each profession can find in it rules of conduct, guidance in their doubts, information to dispel their ignorance, and encouragement to fame and good deeds. Through history the ruler is assisted in his ambition to do great and righteous deeds, and consequently to live in the future. [...] Can we not see that the most outstanding victories, the most worshipped deeds fed each other throughout history? For instance, according to the testimonies of all old historians, the conquest of Asia by Alexander the Great was inspired by his frequent reading of the *Iliad*. Who does not know that this famous victor always carried on him, in a golden box, the poem of Homer; and what is the *Iliad* but history in verse, the oldest and most beautiful of all? Without going so far back in time, have we not seen in our own days another Alexander in the person of Charles XII, who awakened his genius to glory by reading the life of the Macedonian, written by Quintus Curtius? Which emperor, which ruler should not be in awe of history, that extraordinary tribunal which will judge them with the same impartiality as the ancient Egyptians judged their kings who had passed away?

The lawmaker, the statesman learns from history the deeds of rulers, their strengths and weaknesses; the diverse governments under which they flourished, the laws that influenced power, culture, and the morals of the people for better or for worse. The soldier finds in history the most righteous and truthful things about strategy; the writer and the philosopher discern in it the advancement of the human spirit, its wanderings, the discoveries of genius and the reasons for ignorance, superstition and darkness. The common person, when reading history, finds in it comfort for present evils; it shows him that through a sad fatality there has never been perfection in the world, virtue has almost always been persecuted in life, and the reward has most often come only after death. Who should not forget pain and discontent, when history shows that citizens able to rule the whole world were the victims of tyranny, and quite often at the hands of their own compatriots? We must forget our own misfortune when we see that Socrates was forced to swallow poison from the hand of the Athenians themselves; that Aristides was subjected to ostracism, for the very reason that he was called 'the righteous,' and that Cato committed suicide so as not to see his country in slavery. It is impossible for someone, inspired by such examples, not to strengthen his character, not to wish to imitate the most outstanding men, sacrificing himself and craving for the common good. [...]

History in itself can show us, like a wide panorama, the kingdoms of past millennia; it makes us spectators of the series of battles and revolutions that have taken place since the beginning [of time]; it unearths our ancestors and shows them to us alive, with their virtues, passions, and traditions. [History] connects us to eternity, establishing communication between the past and us, and again between us and our offspring, with whom it shares our deeds. Besides all these, history has another precious feature: that it enables us to justly judge the facts of our contemporaries, whom we do not have the courage or the ability to know rightly.

The study of history, gentlemen, has always been the major preoccupation of thinkers. However, it has never had the importance it enjoys today. [In old times] only soldiers and philosophers [...] tasted it. Today, however, wherever a nation is somewhat developed, history is good for all walks of life. In France, the peasant, seeking to rest in the evenings after the toil of the day, reads by the side of the fire about the great reforms of the Constitution and the magnificent conquests of Napoleon. In Prussia I have often chanced to see a worker of the land at rest, reading in the shadow of a tree, about Frederic the Great! This fortunate popularity of history is due to two things. The first is that today any citizen has the right and duty to be concerned

about state affairs, anyone may desire to know what are the national rights gained by our ancestors and how to protect them; and where can a person find them better presented than in history? The second reason, and the major one, is the discovery of the printing press. Thanks a thousand times to him who discovered this art, the one that most disseminates and preserves things, without which history would never have acquired the universality that it enjoys today. I cannot adequately demonstrate to you how much the lack of this important discovery threw confusion in tales, uncertainty and darkness all over. This shortcoming, gentlemen, is the reason why, among the Romanians, even among the more outstanding ones, there are so few who know history. Here the printing press is not yet so free and widespread; we do not have any universal history published in the national language yet; and why should I speak of universal history, when the very annals of the history of our country lie in darkness, preserved in the form of manuscripts only, of which—because of the scribes—you cannot find two the same. Despite all these [obstacles], the printing press would be the safest and the most rapid means to reach the level of civilization of European society. [...]

If history, especially the history of mankind, is so interesting in terms of its results, how much more so should be the history of our country, the place where we first saw the light? Before the nation people have always loved their family, before the world they have loved their nation and the portion of land, whether large or small, where their parents lived and died, where they were born and spent their childhood years that never come back, where they felt the first joy and the first manly pain. I feel this feeling, and I do not know any nation, or people, however savage, that does not have it. I would move too much away from my subject if I set out to give you examples of this; they are numberless. [...]

You will find a Romanian in me, but never one that contributes to 'Romanomania,' that is, the mania of calling ourselves Romans, an obsession that is in vogue today, especially in Transylvania and with certain writers from Wallachia. Petru Maior [...], in his book about the beginnings of the Romanians, published for the first time in 1812, like a new Moses, revived the national spirit, which had been dead for over a century; we owe him a great deal of the patriotic impulse which has since appeared in all three provinces of the old Dacia. Nevertheless, he had the misfortune of calling to life a rather numerous school of new Romanians, who—failing to support their words with actions—think that they attract the respect of the world when they shout out loud that they descend from the Romans, that they are Romans and therefore the first people on earth. This mania has reached so far that some people even

boast as ours the deeds of the old Romans, from Romulus to Romulus Augustus. Thus, in an epic poem, Mr. Aristia,¹ whom I esteem as the fine translator of a part of the *Iliad*, exalted by an enthusiasm little befitting a Roman, calls Longinus, the Roman soldier who pierced the side of Our Lord Jesus Christ when He was crucified, a Romanian, and cannot hide his joy that the first Christian was also a Romanian.

Let us watch out, gentlemen, for this mania brings upon us the laughter of foreigners. In our present position, the first duty is—as our first quality should be—modesty; otherwise, we deserve what Mr. Eliad² says, that only bankrupt nations refer constantly to their ancestors [...]. Even if we are descended from Hercules, if we are rogues the world will know us as such; on the contrary, if we get rid of demoralization and civic discord, which drive us to peril, we shall approach with more determined steps the path of brotherhood, of patriotism, of a sound, not superficial, civilization, as we have it; then Europe will respect us, even if we are descended from the hordes of Genghis Khan. Therefore, gentlemen, I will not hide from you that our laws, customs, language and beginnings stretch back to the Romans; history asserts these truths with firmness, but let me tell you once again that I am far from gratifying a ridiculous mania by talking to you about the deeds of the Romans as if they were ours. I am going to do something more useful, though; if you really want to be known as true sons of the Romans, I will urge you to do what resembles the deeds of the ruling people of the world. [...]

Translated by Mária Kovács

¹ Costache Aristia (c. 1800–1880), poet, actor, professor of Greek and French in Bucharest.

² Ion Heliade-Rădulescu (1802–1872), writer, philologist, politician.

FRANTIŠEK PALACKÝ: HISTORY OF THE CZECH NATION IN BOHEMIA AND MORAVIA

Title: *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a v Moravě* (History of the Czech nation in Bohemia and Moravia)

Originally published: First published in, Prague, J. G. Kalve, 1848–67

Language: Czech

The excerpts used are from František Palacký, *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a v Moravě*, 3rd ed., compiled and edited by Josef Kalousek, approved by Palacký [considered the definitive version of this work] (Prague: 1876, F. Tempský) vol. I., pp. 9–15.

About the author

František Palacký [1798, Hodslavice (*Ger.* Hotzendorf, Northern Moravia) – 1876, Prague]: politician and historian. He came from a traditional Protestant (Czech Brethren) family from Moravia. He studied at the Lutheran Latin school in Trenčsén (*Slo.* Trenčín, present-day Slovakia) and the Lutheran lyceum in Pressburg (*Hun.* Pozsony; *Slo.* Prešporok; today Bratislava). Here, he became acquainted with the ideas of Czech patriotism and Slav reciprocity. Among his friends were Ján Benedikti, Pavel Josef Šafařík and **Ján Kollár**. After 1818, he was tutor to a couple of Hungarian noble families and was concerned principally with aesthetics. In 1823 he went to Prague with the intention of studying Czech history. He was employed as a genealogist for the aristocratic Sternberg family and studied historical methods under the tutelage of **Josef Dobrovský**. In 1829, the Estates appointed Palacký as historian of the Bohemian Kingdom. At the time he was instrumental in providing Czech patriots with a firm institutional background for their endeavors. He started the *Časopis Českého museum* (Journal of the Czech Museum) in 1827, the most important Czech scholarly journal of this period. He also made important contributions to the *Matice česká* foundation, which supported the publication of books written in Czech. As a secretary of the Patriotic Museum Society, he proposed in 1841 that the main task of the Museum should be the scholarly representation of the Bohemian Lands and turned it into an important center of ‘national academic life’. Palacký entered politics in 1848 as a member of the National Committee, and became a deputy of the Imperial Diet (*Reichsrat*) and president of the Pan-Slav Congress in Prague. He was a delegate to the Constituent Assembly of 1848–49. Palacký formulated a liberal bourgeois political program, and later became the unchallenged intellectual leader of the Czech liberal National Party and remained so until the end of his life.

He retired from active politics in the neo-absolutist period of the 1850s but resumed his involvement in the 1860s after the renewal of the constitutional order. He was a deputy to the Bohemian Diet and, in 1861, became the only Czech ever elected to the upper chamber of the *Reichsrat*. In subsequent years Palacký was one of the chief opponents of dualism and later supported the historical 'state-rights' (*Staatsrecht*) arrangement of the Empire as opposed to the Austro-Hungarian '*Ausgleich*' (compromise) of 1867. After 1871 he concentrated on publishing collections of his articles on politics, aesthetics, history, and literature, and also worked to complete his history of the Czech nation. Palacký was a leading personality in the Czech national movement for more than fifty years. In the Czech national historical canon he used to be referred to as the 'father of the nation'; for his academic work he has been dubbed the 'founder' of modern Czech historiography.

Main works: *Počátkové českého básnictví, obzvláště prozodie* [The beginnings of Czech poetry, especially of prosody] with P. J. Šafařík (1818); *Starší letopisové čeští* [Old Bohemian annals] (1829); *Archiv český* [Czech Archive, an edition of sources] 6 vols., (1840–72); *Würdigung der alten böhmischen Geschichtsschreiber* [An appreciation of old Bohemian historians] (1830); *Geschichte von Böhmen* [History of Bohemia] 5 vols., (1836–67); *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a v Moravě* [History of the Czech nation in Bohemia and Moravia] 5 vols., (1848–67); *Idea státu rakouského* [The idea of the Austrian State] (1865); *Radhost. Sbirka z oboru řeči a literatury české, krásovědy, historie a politiky* [Radhost: A collection from the fields of Czech language and literature, aesthetics, history, and politics] 3 vols., (1871–73); *Gedenkblätter. Auswahl von Denkschriften, Aufsätzen und Briefen aus den letzten fünfzig Jahren* [Commemorative papers: A selection of memoirs, articles and letters from the last fifty years] (1874).

Context

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the paradigm of historical science in Europe shifted from Enlightenment universalism towards the individuality of historical phenomena and the Herderian *Geist* of the nations. At the same time, historical writings reached the growing bourgeois public and turned into an important tool for social emancipation and national mobilization. With a certain time lag, the basic principles of methodological historicism and Romantic ideas about history found fertile soil in Bohemia as well. Whereas the previous generations of scholars concentrated on the history of the country, matching it with the enlightened *Landespatriotismus*, the new generation of Czech patriots turned towards the historical individuality of the Czech nation. The devising of an expedient interpretation of the national past anchored in world history was understood to be the natural concluding phase of the historian's research.

František Palacký was the chief representative of the new approach to history in the Czech context. In the 1820s he worked on a genealogy of the

house of Sternberg, which in turn provided him with access to academic institutions (the Royal Bohemian Learned Society and the Patriotic Museum). Later, as the official Bohemian historiographer commissioned by the Bohemian Estates, he was entrusted with continuing the *Chronologische Geschichte Böhmens*, initiated by his predecessor, František Pubička, in the 1770s. Palacký, however, decided to write a completely new history based on a much larger collection of sources and scholarly literature than Pubička's. The first result of this great effort (accompanied by many critical articles and studies as well as editions of documents) was the first volume of the *Geschichte von Böhmen*, published in 1836. In 1848, however, he began the publication of a Czech edition, which was factually and ideologically modified. The last volume, treating events up to the Battle of Mohács in 1526, was published in 1867. In the early 1870s Palacký published a revised narrative of the Hussite period in three volumes. Between 1876 and 1878 the third and final version of the whole series was published.

Whereas in the German version Palacký took the geographical and constitutional perspective ('Böhmen') as the basic criterion, in the Czech version the leitmotif is the Czech nation now understood ethnically. He also added some philosophical meditations (inspired especially by Herder and Hegel) on both history and his own religious and national convictions. He argued that 'historical truth' should be the historiographer's leading principle, though at the same time the basic purpose of historical writings should be to serve the nation. Palacký devised a new interpretation of the history of the Bohemian Lands, which he saw as a constant, dialectical struggle between the Germanic and Slavic elements. The prevalently 'democratic' order of Slavs, he argues, reigned in Bohemia until the thirteenth century, before being replaced by the 'feudal' German order that came with medieval colonization. The Hussite movement and the Czech Brethren embodied the Slavic element once again. Hussitism was for Palacký the last great rise of Slavic democracy and also the first European Reformation and democratic revolution. What, however, ensued was the Battle of the White Mountain (1620), where the Bohemian Protestants were defeated, followed by the Habsburg Counter-Reformation, which brought a new form of feudalism, a political order of ultimately Germanic origin. The democratic, national movement in the nineteenth century thus became the antithesis of this German feudal order. In Palacký's conception, however, the struggle between the Germanic and Slavic principles was not necessarily a detrimental one; rather, it also involved positive cultural exchange and, at a deeper level, it was a part of an ontological move towards humanity and progress.

Palacký's influence on later Czech politicians and thinkers can hardly be overstated. As much as he defined the political discourse of Czech national liberalism in his political writings and activity, he also set out the basic field for interpretations of Czech national history in his *opus magnum*, entitled 'History of the Czech nation in Bohemia and Moravia.' Every subsequent historical school or thinker had to come to terms with his interpretation. Whereas his line of argument was in one way or another adopted by national liberals of all sorts, including **Tomáš G. Masaryk**, and later, in a more deformed way, also by the Communists, it tended to be contested by the positivist Jaroslav Goll and his school of historiography (from the 1890s), as well as Roman Catholic and pro-Habsburg historical narratives. (See **Tomáš G. Masaryk**, *The Czech question* and **Josef Pekař**, *The meaning of Czech history*)

MK

History of the Czech nation in Bohemia and Moravia

Introduction

[...]

The history of the Czech nation is in numerous respects more instructive and more interesting than the history of many other nations. As the Bohemian Lands are located in the center, the heart of Europe, the Czech nation has for many centuries been the central point where elements and principles of national, State, and Church life in modern Europe have, not without a struggle, been in contact. The long conflict as well as the intermingling of Roman, German and Slav elements in Europe is particularly evident here.

No historical report tells us how the human race, being one and the same in nature and origin, had nevertheless split up into so many races, tribes, nations and branches, which are different in physical stature and color, temperament and language, manners and customs. At the very beginning of the historical age we can observe not only the breaking up of all humanity into innumerable nations great and small, languages and dialects, communities and states, different from each other and independent of each other, but also an evident tendency of all history to the reduction of this diversity, the mingling and uniting of clans and races, the vanishing of some and the rise of others. The weak perished in contact with the strong, and the strong submitted to the even stronger; but, ultimately, spiritual and moral strength triumphed over physical strength. Yet, as nothing in the material world perishes completely, when one being decomposes it becomes the embryo of another

being; and as races always become stronger and more refined with mixing, as orchards do with grafting, the mingling and merging of various nations is ultimately to the benefit of mankind, setting in motion the human spirit, making it more flexible, constantly fertilizing it with new elements. [...]

The most important, noble result and phenomenon of the whole distant past was the perfect joining and uniting of the religion of Christ with the culture of Greece in a world ruled by Rome. If this union had not been broken at the very beginning owing to divine fate, the whole world would have perforce eventually become Roman; but God, who in his infinite wisdom did not make even two grains of sand absolutely alike, wanted far less mere uniformity in his most noble creature, which he had, to a degree, made in his own image. Imperial Rome may have cultivated the art of ruling and governing to the highest level of perfection, but since it always had more shortcomings than virtues it eventually became the model of a government that should not be. Concentrating all political power and will in one head, it ultimately stifled all independent development of the spirit, all independent action and initiative, both of individual persons and of whole communities and nations. [...]

Upon the ruins of Roman world-rule the German world set its own scepter. With the Germans' tearing of the nets that had from above long stifled all initiative in the nations, man regained his rights; personal energy, which had been destroyed by the policies of the Caesars, again made its way to the summit, and again began to give laws to the world. It is, however, no secret that this change, no matter how beneficial in itself, had as a consequence new vices. The fact is that the German broke Roman rule apart for his own benefit, not for the general prosperity of the various nations. The desire for property and power, not a feeling or a need for freedom, powerfully armed him and stirred him to search for his happiness abroad. Consequently, he did not abolish oppression in Europe, nor did he wish to; he only changed an enfeebled autarchy into a rampant oligarchy. With that change, however, his own national life began to diversify. Soon, as if by escheat, the principles of German spirit, energy and industry were joined to everything vital that remained of the Roman world. The zealotry of the Christian faith and the art of government began to cultivate a new centralism, which, though divided between the empire and the papacy, was in harmony at least for many centuries.

As soon as the German, by conquest, took over the great legacy of ancient Rome, the peaceful Slav, who had been quietly advancing behind him, settled down beside him. Together with him a new national element entered European life, no less noble, but no less blemished. Freedom and equality of all

citizens, like sons of the same family, were the principal features of ancient Slav society; if only harmony had also been joined to them! Had their sundry nations, like individual persons under the aegis of a higher power, been given the opportunity to be spared all the extraordinary tempests and disasters, their patriarchal manners and customs might perhaps have been enough to ensure their welfare. The Slav's piety, simplicity and gentleness did not rid him of all his intransigence. Not wanting either dominion or a state, but only communities, he refused both national unity and the strong bonds of regimen and government; wanting the same rights and freedoms for all at home, he demanded that everybody keep to the same path of the old customs; not permitting either estates or privileges, he did not accept the influence of outstanding figures or the rapid development of higher education; not longing for conquest, he hardly knew how to defend himself in his own territory; seeking to enjoy the fruits of his fields in peace, all the more often was he subject to the dictates of foreigners. If he was not to die out once and for all, the Slav had perforce over the centuries to change his ways and mix Roman and German elements into the life of his nation.

The principal matter and the basic feature of all Bohemian-Moravian history are therefore, as we have seen, continuous contact and conflict between the Slav, Roman and German characters. But because the Roman character does not touch the Czechs directly but almost solely through Germandom, it can also be said that Czech history is in general based mainly on conflict with Germandom, in other words, on the Czechs' acceptance or rejection of German manners and regimen. It may be true that this contact between both elements also occurred among other Slav tribes, but it was either less diverse, lively and penetrating, for example, as between the Poles and Russians, or it ended long ago with the extinction of Slav nationality, as amongst the former Lusatian Sorbs, Obodrites and other Polabians. The Czech nation, affiliating itself with the German nation as an equal, and entering into the closest unions with it for more than a thousand years, has to the present day defended its nationality. And no matter how many German things it has adopted and experienced spiritually, it has not on that account ceased to be a Slav nation. Even today it has the same historic role, owing both to its history and its geographical position—namely, to serve as a bridge between Germandom and Slavdom, and also between the East and West of Europe in general.

When interpreting the history of the Czech nation we shall therefore explain what phenomena became visible as a result of this ancient conflict and struggle in our country—a struggle carried out not only on the frontiers of the Bohemian Lands but also within them, not only against foreigners but also

against locals, not only with the shield and the sword but also with word and spirit, institutions and customs, openly and covertly, with distinguished zeal and blind passion, and not only for victory or subjugation but also for reconciliation. We shall demonstrate how a nation small in number was nevertheless able sometimes to achieve a great name, and how it could also fall so low that it was denied that name. We can see how being tossed about by tempests from East and West, abroad and at home, it several times abandoned the hope that it could preserve its existence, and yet has to this day never lost hope in the future. [...]

Observing the chief differences in Czech history, without difficulty we can note at first glance three ages—namely, the *early*, *middle* and *modern*. The middle age is marked by the religious skirmishes that entered Czech public life with the start of Hussitism in 1403 and ended with the expulsion of all Utraquists from the country in 1627. In that age our nation reached the zenith of its historical importance. What preceded it and what followed must be considered part of early and modern history, respectively. [...]

Translated by Derek Paton

MIHÁLY HORVÁTH: HISTORY OF THE HUNGARIAN WAR OF INDEPENDENCE OF 1848–1849

Title: *Magyarország függetlenségi harczának története 1848 és 1849-ben* (History of the Hungarian war of independence of 1848–1849)

Originally published: Geneva, Miklós Puky, 1865

Language: Hungarian

The excerpts used are from the 'Introduction', pp. 3–7.

About the author

Mihály Horváth [1809, Szentes (Southeast Hungary) – 1879, Karlsbad (Cz. Karlovy Vary, present-day Czech Republic)]: historian and Catholic clergyman. He was born into an impoverished family and studied theology at a Church seminary. After publishing a number of historical studies, he was elected a member of the Hungarian Academy in 1842. Horváth became a fervent participant in the reform movement as one of the major liberal cultural figures and the most important representative of the liberal clergy. In 1848 the revolutionary government nominated him bishop of Csanád. He was the only Catholic high churchman who followed the revolutionary government to Debrecen. In 1849 he served as Minister of Religious Affairs and Education in Bertalan Szemere's government. After the defeat of the revolution he went into hiding and later escaped to Belgium. He was sentenced to death *in absentia*. Later he settled in Geneva, and wrote authoritative studies on the Reform Age and the history of the revolution. His most important work, 'Twenty-five years of the history of Hungary,' established the canonical historiographical image of the Hungarian 'national awakening' and had immense influence in keeping the cultural memory of the '1848 generation' alive. Receiving amnesty, he returned in 1867 and supported the Compromise. In 1877 he became the president of the Hungarian Historical Society. He is considered the most important historian of the liberal nationalist tradition in Hungary.

Main works: *Az ipar és kereskedelem története Magyarországon a három utolsó század alatt* [The history of Hungarian industry and commerce in the last three centuries] (1840); *Az 1514-iki pórlázadás, annak okai s következményei* [The peasant revolt of 1514, its causes and consequences] (1841); *A magyarok története* [The history of the Hungarians] (1842–46); *Huszonöt év Magyarország történelméből* [Twenty-five years of the history of Hungary] (1864); *Magyarország függetlenségi harczának története 1848 és 1849-ben* [History of the Hungarian war of independence of 1848–1849] 3 vols., (1865); *Magyarország történelme* [History of Hungary] 8 vols., (1871–73).

Context

Hungarian historiography at the beginning of the nineteenth century was marked by a duality—a more professional genre of ‘official historiography’ written mostly in Latin and German and usually marked by an emphatically pro-Habsburg perspective (for example, the works of Johann Christian Engel), and a more popular genre written in the vernacular but falling short of the more strictly conceived criteria of scientific historiography (for example, the *Magyar századok*—‘Hungarian centuries’—by Benedek Virág). The situation changed dramatically by the 1830s, with the new wave of liberal nationalist historians writing in Hungarian. Mihály Horváth emerged, in the mid-1830s, as the most important historian of the liberal political movement. Following the ideas of German romantic historiography, as typified by Carl Rotteck, on the ancient egalitarianism of the Germans, and in line with other Central European historians of the period, for example, the Polish **Joachim Lelewel**, Horváth sought initially to identify the roots of the nation’s peculiar liberties in the archaic communitarianism of the early Hungarians when they were as yet uncorrupted by foreign models. Thus, in his ‘Comparison between the the civic and moral culture of the Hungarian nation in the time when they were moving to Europe and the Europe of those times’ (1835), he contrasted favorably the free and egalitarian society of the Hungarians at the time of their arrival in the Carpathian Basin (described as a ‘national family’) with the feudal anarchy of contemporary Europe.

Horváth came to modify this vision in the context of the 1839–1840 Diet, which articulated a number of liberal demands for the support of national industry and the emancipation of the peasantry. Subsequently, he addressed questions of socio-economic progress in his works written under the direct influence of Wilhelm Wachsmuth and Arnold Hermann Ludwig Heeren, both prominent liberal historians of the *Vormärz* period, in whose works the inspiration of Enlightenment historical narratives (such as those of Montesquieu and Adam Smith) blend with Hegelian ideas. Horváth closely followed them in devising a stadial historical model, paying special attention to aspects of socio-economic progress and conceding that liberty was not merely a pre-given trait of the ancient national community but was the result of a dialectic development of socio-economic and political structures.

In this way the historical works written by Horváth in the 1840s sought to promote the cause of the liberal opposition by gradually challenging the traditional vision of the nobility as the focus of the nation, extolling rather the historical role of commerce and the urban population and advocating an ex-

tension of the symbolic framework of the national community to the non-noble population as well. In his history of Hungarian industry and commerce he described the situation of Hungary under Austrian rule in straightforwardly ‘colonial’ terms, accusing the Viennese government of intentionally hindering the modernization of Hungary. His work on the history of the peasant revolt of 1514 went even further in such radicalism, championing the cause of the peasants and linking the ensuing vicissitudes of Hungarian history to the lack of solidarity between the privileged and non-privileged strata of society. His historical vision had a considerable impact, in particular on young radicals like **Sándor Petőfi** and Pál Vasvári (1826–1849), who became the protagonists of the 1848 revolutionary events.

While Horváth’s early writings were marked by a radical democratic vision, his monumental works written after 1849 were more about ‘canonization’: providing the most influential liberal nationalist historiographical narrative of the course of Hungarian history, and especially the Reform Age and the 1848–49 revolutionary events. Many of his books were originally published abroad while he was in exile, but after his return they were republished in Hungary as well. The fact that Horváth was part of the revolutionary diaspora at the moment of writing the books is also important, as he was obviously intending to write an apology of his generation. Nevertheless, he managed to retain a remarkable impartiality and historical distance.

In the ‘Introduction’ to the volume on the 1848–49 War of Independence, Horváth reiterates the main lines of the developments that preceded the Revolution. He describes the process in terms of the interrelatedness of literary and political renewal, pointing out that the cultural awakening brought along a radical transformation of the social and political framework as well. In his reading, the Reform Age, like any period of transition, had to find a balance between conservatism and anarchy, but it was successful in realizing its program of national and social emancipation. In the twenty-five years preceding the revolution, Hungary made a spectacular advance and created the preconditions for becoming a modern society. This period of achievement can be considered as the most glorious era in Hungarian history, even more important than the age of medieval glory. The emerging new Hungary ceased to be the property of the privileged classes—it became the “home of the whole nation.”

According to Horváth, the Reform Age opened unlimited horizons for social and cultural development: literature, industry, commerce, sciences, urbanization, and civil liberties reached previously unattainable heights. The culmination of this process was the 1847–48 Diet, which introduced a series of political and social reforms. In addition, in March 1848 the first Hungarian

government responsible to the Parliament was formed, and finally, in April, the first series of fundamental laws codifying the achievements of the Revolution was passed. In Horváth's interpretation, these events fit into the general process of modernization, that is to say, the Revolution of 1848 and even the ensuing War of Independence cannot be considered a breach of continuity, as some of the loyalist-conservative pamphleteers claimed, since they represent the logical consequence of the liberal-democratic program of the Reform Age.

Horváth stood at the intersection of different intellectual traditions. Even after 1849 his texts continued to be characterized by references and concepts that had their origins in the political philosophy and historical vision of the Enlightenment. He focused on the concept of *politesse*, the socio-cultural evolution of the society, and—even though he was a priest—the growth of secularization. At the root of his historical narrative, however, there stood a markedly romantic conception of the role of great ideas in history. It is along these lines that he described the spread of liberalism and nationalism as something that was inevitable, being rooted in the *Zeitgeist*.

With his syntheses, blending the achievements of the Reform Age with the 'hagiography' of the War of Independence, he eminently contributed to the formation of the national historiographical canon. At the same time, his stress on the socio-economic progress made his conception ultimately compatible with the liberal narrative emerging after 1867, whereby the 'Compromise' was legitimized as a trade-off in which some of the political demands were given up in exchange for the opportunity of thorough modernization. It is as much due to his uncompromising liberalism as to his methodological flaws that the interwar generation of neo-conservative historians such as **Gyula Szekfű** considered him as the main target of their criticism of the 'Whig interpretation' of Hungarian history.

BT

History of the Hungarian war of independence of 1848–1849

Introduction

The spiritual awakening that commenced in the second decade of our century with the renewal of our language and literature signifies the starting point of a new era of transformation in our national and state life. It affected this nation like an animating breeze; it engendered an upheaval in which the

ancient traditional elements began to dissolve, and, as in a chemical test tube, new formations started to coalesce. Set into motion, society in its incessant activity has dug a new bed for itself, wide and deep like the ideas by which it has been stirred and guided—the ideas of independent nationhood, truth and liberty.

In the material as well as the spiritual world, eras of transformation are always by necessity periods of crisis; for all transformations are nothing but struggles between rejuvenation and evanescence—between life and death. It is no wonder, then, that in social transformations the short-sighted, the timid, the egoist—beholding the dissolution of the old and either not able to conceive the coming rejuvenation or disliking the new developments out of concern for their own interests—see only turbulence, chaos and anarchy, and aspire to preserve the crumbling old order and to impede the development of the new one. It is no wonder that due to such contradictory aspirations, when the champions of the new notions are engaged in a life-or-death struggle against the protectors of the ancient order, society advances between two abysses: the abysses of despotism and licence, from which there is only a narrow path leading to the realms of well-ordered freedom.

It was just such a transformation that the Hungarian nation experienced during the quarter of a century starting in 1823 and ending with the early days of 1848. The struggle between old and new, tradition and justice, tyranny and liberty, foreign influence and an independent, self-reliant nationhood went on uninterrupted and with persistent endurance, and concluded, as I have related elsewhere, with the guardians of the old order being pushed more and more backward, relinquishing space and triumph to their adversaries, while freedom and independent nationhood celebrated their victory.

Without doubt, this quarter of a century was the most glorious period in Hungarian history. This nation has undeniably experienced eras that were more clamorous inwardly and more splendid outwardly, either when under the command of her great kings' genius she stood as an authoritative, superior power in the eastern part of Europe, letting her neighbors all feel the weight of her strength; or when Hungarians were camped in the vales of the Lower Danube and the Balkans as the guardians of Christian civilization, and restraining the sweeping torrent of Ottoman fanaticism and barbarity with innumerable glorious triumphs. But ever since the adoption of Christianity a thousand years before, Hungarian history has never had such a splendid, such a humane period with such a crucial significance for herself as these twenty-five years. In the former, seemingly more brilliant eras the Hungarian nation was outwardly greater, weightier, more active; but in this brief period she laid

the foundation of her inner greatness based on culture, justice and a spiritual and moral loftiness. Quietly rejuvenating, gradually developing, she underwent a complete transformation. By extending and consolidating first and foremost her basis of existence, she secured her own future, thus substantiating the prophecy a major actor¹ in the movements of the era made at the beginning of his career: "The Hungarian nation belongs not to the past but to the future!" In her struggles she trained herself to become a champion of the new age in which the nations no longer fight against each other solely or indeed mostly by blood-shedding material weapons but use spiritual and even moral ones instead; in which the battlefield is the thousand-colored domain of peaceful pursuits; in which the final goal is science and art, industry and assiduousness, welfare and prosperity, the comfort and embellishment of life, human rights and justice for everyone, equality and liberty, brotherhood and progress on the endless course towards perfection.

What had Hungary been before this era, and in particular in the times directly preceding it? A medieval state weakened by a thousand vicissitudes, which, lingering miserably amidst the ruins of her one-time greatness, lived only for the memory of the past; in which even her legal independence and her archaic, traditional constitution were increasingly repressed, curtailed and confined by the power of despotism.

What had the Hungarian nation been before this era? A group of some hundred thousand individuals of the privileged classes, and beside them the millions of oppressed without any rights. A society unable to advance on the path of progress and thus fallen into decay, with obsolete institutions, rough and semi-cultured morals and an almost complete absence of the preconditions and means of welfare and culture. A backward, impoverished society whose every material, spiritual and moral interest languished in the same condition as they had been in the mid-eighteenth century; where landed property, in the hands of a few men, fettered by feudal institutions, yielded but a poor profit or even lay fallow; where industry and commerce stagnated in torpor, neglected, undervalued and undeveloped; where science and art were still slumbering in their cradles or were as yet unborn; where the institutes of education were mostly schools of blind faith and prejudice which left children spiritually dull and morally puny. A lifeless society sunk into slumber, where a thick mist enveloped its spiritual life, and the field of literature was illuminated for rare moments, as though by the light of a shooting star,

¹ An allusion to a famous line by **István Széchenyi** in his programmatic work, *Hitel* (Credit).

by the genius of a solitary poet; a society which the light and nimbleness of nineteenth century civilization had hardly started to penetrate; whose social conditions were caught in the spell of immobility; in which no life, no association, no discourse existed, and all things were frozen in a deep slumber.

And what has Hungary and the Hungarian nation changed into during this era? From a slow people brooding over its decay it became a lively, merry nation permeated by the vigor of youth, progress and growth. Her social conditions are rejuvenated, rising, developing and improving in all spheres. Perceptibly on the rise and cherished zealously by particular individuals and associations, industry and commerce, the markedly improving means of transport, steamship navigation, railways and roads are all increasingly developing—diffusing prosperity into every layer of society. Everyone studies and aspires to augment his knowledge and spread culture. Literature is developing at an amazing speed, and in proximity with it the arts are acclimatizing step by step: beside the necessities, the useful and beautiful are devotedly tended and cherished. Budapest, where the spiritual and material powers of the country are more and more concentrated, is enjoying a rapid rise; its population has doubled in number in a little time; from a middling provincial town it is becoming a European market, while its beauties and comforts are growing in proportion to its size. And in addition, some provincial towns are also starting to progress. The privileged classes are on the one hand claiming back for the country her legal independence, formerly impaired in so many ways, since the country has entered into a bond with Austria with regard to their joint sovereignty; on the other hand—and let us give thanks for their discretion, their selfless, humane and generous aspirations—they themselves take a lead in the reforms. In order to raise the homeland, the nation, from her lethargy, they voluntarily give up their centuries-long privileges, elevating to their own level the masses formerly destitute of any rights; they themselves struggle with unremitting zeal for the abolition of privileges against the government and its few allies alarmed by the phantoms of democracy, and they share in a brotherly fashion with the lower classes of the people the possession of land now free and all the blessings of the constitution, its rights and responsibilities. Thanks to their tireless efforts, labor and association, thought and conscience, pulpit and press are becoming free. Every new parliamentary session adds new liberties to the ones already attained, regaining one by one the various aspects of impaired, legitimate national independence. Every year brings on new growth of material and moral developments, constantly increasing prosperity, freedom, and culture, until the Parliament of 1847–48 completely re-establishes the nation's legal independence on the

one hand; while on the other hand, it puts through the reforms devised and debated with such a noble enthusiasm for twenty years, thus completing the splendid work of national transformation. In order to secure every individual and communal freedom and complete national independence, it establishes a common court beside the old municipal institutions as well as home guards, popular representation and a responsible parliamentary government; and, above all, it raises the free press to stand guard over individual, social and national liberties. [...]

Translated by Dávid Oláh

JAKUB MALÝ: OUR NATIONAL REBIRTH

Title: *Naše znovuzrození* (Our national rebirth)

Originally published: Prague, Otto, 1880–84, 6 vols.

Language: Czech

Excerpts taken from the preface, 'Všeobecné úvahy' [General considerations], in *Naše znovuzrození*, vol. 1. (Prague: Otto, 1880–84), pp. 1–14.

About the author

Jakub Josef Dominik Malý [1811, Prague – 1885, Prague]: writer, translator and journalist. Born into a bourgeois family, he read philosophy and law at Prague. During his life Malý worked as an editor on various newspapers and journals and in publishing houses. He devoted himself to the popularization of Czech history and literature and to translations from European languages. He promoted the study of English (to balance the German predominance) and was the first to begin the systematic translation of Shakespeare into Czech. He was well known for his controversy with the liberal politician and journalist **Karel Havlíček Borovský** in the early 1850s, and later for a debate with the so-called 'Máj-generation' in literature (particularly with Jan Neruda and Vítězslav Hálek), the most forward-looking Czech literary movement of its time. Malý continued to promote the ideals of national literature as formulated by **Josef Jungmann**. He defended metrical prosody, regarded folksongs as the ultimate model for poetry, and stated that the work of art should have a 'national content.' He was involved in almost all the important encyclopaedic undertakings of his time. He collaborated with Jungmann on the Czech-German dictionary project; later he was engaged as an editor of Rieger's encyclopaedia. In 1884, together with the publisher Jan Otto, he initiated the largest Czech encyclopaedia, the twenty-eight-volume *Ottův slovník naučný*. Malý was one of the main representatives of the conservative branch of the national movement. As such he was criticized by younger generations of national liberals as well as artists. He never belonged to the upper echelons of the national movement's pantheon.

Main works: *Národní české pohádky a pověsti* [Czech national folktales and legends] (1838); *Nástin slovesnosti* [An outline of literature] (1848); *František Ladislav Čelakovský* (1852); *Amerika od času svého odkrytí* [America since its discovery] (1853–1857); *Vzpomínky a úvahy starého vlastence* [The recollections and meditations of an old patriot] (1872); *Jan Erazim Vocel* (1872); *Shakespeare a jeho dílo* [Shakespeare and his works] (1873); *Život a působení Jiřího Melantricha z Aventina* [The life and work of Jiří Melantrich of Aventinum] (1880); *Naše znovuzrození* [Our national rebirth] 6 vols., (1880–1884).

Context

In the 1860s two factions emerged in the Czech liberal nationalist camp: a conservative one, and a liberal one with more radical nationalist rhetoric. The latter established itself institutionally in 1874, breaking off from the 'Old Czech Party' (the National Party) and founding the new 'Young Czech Party' (officially, the National Liberal Party). Led by František Ladislav Rieger, the Old Czech Party resumed its activity in the Imperial Diet in October 1879 after renouncing the politics of 'passive resistance.' They joined 'the Iron Circle of the Right' of Prime Minister Eduard Taaffe and followed the politics of 'gradual gains.' Some of the most important measures taken by this group were the new language statutes (the codification of the usage of Czech and German as the official languages in the Bohemian Lands) and the division of the Charles-Ferdinand University in Prague into a German part and a Czech part.

Malý belonged to the Old Czechs. He disagreed publicly with the journalist **Karel Havlíček Borovský**, who radically defended national and democratic principles against Viennese neo-absolutism in the early 1850s. He proposed a change in conservative patriotic politics in the late 1850s, suggesting his own definition of the nation, which was rooted in the basic Romantic *topoi*. Whereas his initial notion was a rather essentialist understanding of the nation as an eternal being, in later writings it became a more dynamic concept, through which he attributed an active role to every nation in the world. It was the very creativity of a nation that justified and warranted its place among other nations. Malý therefore proposed the concept of the "organic unity of patriotism and cosmopolitanism." At the same time, however, he fought against the young literary generation grouped around the almanac *Máj* (Jan Neruda, Vítězslav Hálek, Adolf Heyduk, Karolína Světlá). They set out to create a new style of writing that elaborated on the literary legacy of Karel Hynek Mácha (1810–1836), the greatest Czech Romantic poet, the title of whose major work is *Máj* (May). Malý accused them of breaking with Czech literary tradition and of using a "mere descriptive realism" without referring to any ideal values. Whereas they exalted the Romantic poetry of Mácha, Malý insisted that the whole generation of the 1830s, including **Ján Kollár** and F. L. Čelakovský, with their concepts of Slav reciprocity and national literature, should be taken into account.

Malý substantially influenced the conservative branch of Czech liberalism, of which he was a representative. In the last two decades of his life he summed up his ideas and convictions in two major works which constitute the first

comprehensive accounts of the ‘Czech national awakening’—*Vzpomínky a úvahy starého vlastence* (The recollections and meditations of an old patriot) (1872) and *Naše znovuzrození* (Our national rebirth) (1880–84). In the preface to the latter Malý gives an account of what constitutes the Czech nation and its place among other European nations, together with its main features. He reminded his readers of the supposedly pre-eminent position of the Czechs in the Middle Ages. The most important geographical factor was their proximity to the ‘hostile’ Germans. What saved Czechs from being Germanized, however, was their “indefatigable life-force,” which was evident in the language and above all in the literary rebirth of the nineteenth century. He considered the gains of the “national resurgence” to be of great importance, though he noticed that not all the identified goals had been reached.

In Malý’s text we find all the important elements of the ‘legend’ of national rebirth. Following the political split in 1874, the emphasis and meaning of these elements (anti-German resentment, stereotypical self-victimization, and the myth of rebirth) became—divergences in political strategy notwithstanding—a key point of contention between the conservative-liberal nationalism of the Old Czechs and the more radical nationalism of the Young Czechs. While both groups generally used the same cultural, historical, and intellectual references, in the latter’s vision national particularism prevailed over the universalism supported by the older generation. While the Old Czechs lost their political significance in the last decade of the century, the dominance of the ‘Young Czechs’ was soon challenged by new emerging political forces that advanced very different political and cultural discourses.

MK

Our national rebirth

We are fully entitled to call the awakening of our nation to new activity after many centuries of sleep its ‘rebirth,’ because it is no meaningless cliché to say that it was almost laid in its grave, over which its enemies, with scarcely concealed glee in their hearts, were about to sing in full chorus the celebrated ‘De profundis.’

The Czech nation is, without exaggeration, both by nature and by experience, the sole example of this process in Europe, and this needs to be firmly fixed in our consciousness for a thorough knowledge of ourselves and as a lesson that will save us. Our nation has outstanding aspects, praiseworthy and not praiseworthy, and it is from those, in connection with its geographical location

and the special external relations stemming from this, that its history, which is without question an *essential part of the cultural history of Europe*, developed.

Our nation is a *nation of culture kat'exochen*,¹ which it demonstrated in each field of human endeavor: the oldest treasures of its literature, for which one would be hard pressed to find an equal, are characteristic of this; it proved itself as such with its state-building power, suddenly uniting various elements into a powerful political whole at a time when other homogeneous tribes were perishing as a result of dispersal and in-fighting; it demonstrated this during the whole period of its independence, always moving at the forefront of progress and holding high the torch of enlightenment, though pitch black was still spreading all round, veiling everything in darkness. These things, I believe, do not need to be demonstrated, for they are truly known the world over, only blind national hatred can deny them. *The Czechs as a nation never served reactionary tendencies!*

But it was not only with weapons of the spirit that our brave forebears knew how to rule. They were also always ready to draw the sword for their convictions, not counting their enemies, to stake their property and lives for the idea they were enthusiastic about, to defend to the death freedom of action and thought, as true knights of freedom. Europe experienced not only the fighting spirit of their weapons but also, after the decline of the nation as a consequence of exhaustion, the beneficial cultural activity of its dispersed exiles.

Yes, our nation fell from exhaustion, and, being small in number, had from the very beginning, owing to an unfavorable twist of fate, more enemies than any other nation had. In the first place it is fitting to recall the long-standing, almost naturally ingrained, sworn enmity of the Germans towards all Slavdom, which was directed against the Czechs with an even greater obstinacy when the Czechs, of all the western Slavs whom they had closer relations with, put up such a stubborn resistance to their efforts to subjugate that it would not have taken much more for them to obtain hegemony in the German Empire itself. The German hatred of the Czechs then passed, traditionally and unconsciously so to say, to other European nations, as the Slav element was till recently considered by the Western world to lie outside the area of European civilization, and the Slav race was considered the lowest among the nations of culture. [...]

Yet, to be fair, we cannot conceal the fact that our nation fell so far into decline essentially also because of flaws inherent to it: excessive high spirits,

¹ From Greek: above all, especially.

carelessness, partisanship, adversity, a fondness for foreign things, self-denigration, an insufficient sense of community, and our becoming too rapidly dispirited in misfortune, which results in languor and apathy. These flaws are without a doubt the legacy of the whole Slav race, and stand in more than one respect in opposition to the excellent characteristics of the Czech nation, so that in the course of history this very same people sometimes appears to have been outright exchanged for some other. [...]

But, in greatest decline, in deepest humiliation, when to all appearances it already seemed that the Czech nation was to be expunged forever from the ranks of European nations, lo and behold, here, beyond all expectations, its most powerful characteristic proved itself – namely, an undying vital force, which did not allow it to perish. *The Czech nation in the true sense of the word rose from the dead.* [...]

It happened by a *resurrection of the Czech language*, which had during the deplorable years after the Battle of the White Mountain² gradually vanished from the public offices, from the intercourse of the upper classes, from the families of nobles and wealthier burgers, from literature and ultimately also from schools, into which German had been introduced, even in the villages. Everything was heading towards the ultimate Germanization of the nation, and things had truly gone so far that no properly attired person would have readily dared to speak Czech in public in the larger towns. Czech survived mainly in country huts alone, being called a peasant language and in the towns the speech of the lowest rabble. [...]

And it was only literature, having grown up from such small beginnings, which brought about that unparalleled wonder that a nation which had declined as much as the Czech, and had been so close to its own extinction, came to life again, and in a relatively short time came upon the world stage as a sprightly youth, in order to claim its right and, with redoubled efforts making up for the period it had slept through, took its place among the civilized nations, a place that, although not always previously outstanding, was honest and dignified.

And our nation achieved that, too. The fact that not all its desires and demands have yet been met, the fact that all its justified claims have not yet come into force, is not through its own fault, but through the fault of unfa-

² In the Battle of White Mountain (Cz. Bílá hora) near Prague, on 8 November 1620, the Bohemian Estates were defeated by the combined armies of Ferdinand II, Holy Roman Emperor, and of the Catholic League. The battle had far-reaching consequences for the Bohemian Kingdom, including recatholicization and emigration of part of the country's Protestant population.

vorable circumstances and, mainly, the fault of the national hatred that has for ages affected us Czechs more than any other nation. [...]

The extent of what we have truly achieved as a result of the political revolution of 1848, if it is to be judged fairly, can be assessed not according to what we demanded and what we continue to strive for with all means possible, but according to what we *formerly* had, or better said, did not have. If we compare our national and political situation from before 1848 with the way it is now, we must, if we want to be unbiased, admit that *enormous*, unanticipated, far-reaching, progress has been made, tremendously affecting all areas of life, and, in its consequences, of a truly extraordinary impact. [...]

The Czech language has *by law* now achieved equality with the German language in all areas of the civil service. Our mother tongue allows a young Czech man to acquire a well-rounded education, both a general and a specialized education; he is given an opportunity to do so not only by the numerous middle schools but also by having a Czech chair at Prague University. The national consciousness, which was previously limited to a modest handful of 'patriots,' has seized the whole Czech people and penetrated into classes and circles which had long ago seemed to be lost to the nation. Literary activity comprises all areas of writing. More than seventy periodicals serve the widest range of interests of public and social life, scholarship, industry and entertainment. Poetry has cast off the shackles of narrow individualism and boldly entered the international field; soaring higher it celebrates triumphs in previously uncusomary spheres. Czech scholars no longer merely reproduce the results of research done by others; rather they enrich science independently with their own research. Literary productivity has in general become so comprehensive that almost a new language has emerged unobserved for the countless new requirements. [...]

And what of the prolific development of the life of clubs, which with joint forces has in almost every field achieved success which individuals would not have been able to achieve even with the greatest of effort. Everywhere we look we have superb evidence of how great are the results achieved in this area. [...]

The most important achievement of political freedom, however, is the *self-government* of the provinces and the municipalities that we enjoy, if not to the extent we would like, but always with such a profound reach that the common weal is to a large extent in our own hands, and it only depends on how much we try to use the power granted to us most beneficially for the good of the country and the nation. [...]

And by what means has all of this been achieved? We have only one answer: through *literature*, the work of a handful of men inflamed with love for

the country and the nation, who with unprecedented sacrifice devoted their strength and lives to the lofty task, no matter how thankless it seemed, of reviving the spirit of the nation, by taking care of its neglected and scorned language. With the renewal of literature the people were attracted to reading, and by reading they educated themselves, became acquainted with the past of their country and their nation and with their present state, as well as the situation of foreign nations, from which they gained political awareness and in general acquired useful knowledge of all kinds; in this way they matured intellectually, and became ripe for the time when the expected turn-around in the political constellation of Europe called them to new activity. Thus it happened that the year 1848, as was thoroughly demonstrated later, found our nation completely prepared, and it immediately oriented itself in the new situation, and clearly expressed, in the well-known petition to the Government, which came out of the St. Wenceslas meeting,³ the same program that it insists on today. If this had not happened, if the men who had at that time placed themselves at the head of national events had then not immediately had a definite program that the whole nation accepted as its own, the fate of the Czech nation would have been sealed, for, without a defense, it would have fallen into servility to the Germans, who would not have neglected to use the political turnaround, as always, exclusively for themselves, which would obviously mean for our extinction (in Moravia and Silesia as well).

That that did not happen is only thanks to literature, and it is well to bear this in mind. Literature was able to awaken an almost dying nation to new life; consequently there must be some sort of miraculous power in it, which is able to perform such wonders. That is why if we wish to trace the course of our national revival we must above all turn our gaze to literature and its development, from its humble beginnings to its gathering into that force which, though without clamor, has influenced the heart and mind of the nation. [...]

Translated by Derek Paton

³ Reference to the meeting of Prague's burghers in mid-March 1848 in St. Wenceslas' bath which was the beginning of the revolutionary events in Bohemia. The result of the meeting was a petition to the Emperor demanding democratic rights, national equality of Czechs and Germans and legal unification of the lands of the Bohemian Crown.

CONSTANTINOS PAPARRIGOPOULOS: HISTORY OF THE HELLENIC NATION

Title: *Ιστορία τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Ἔθνους ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχαιοτάτων χρόνων μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς* (History of the Hellenic nation from ancient times to the present)

Originally published: Ἀθήνα (Athens), Ανέστης Κωνσταντινίδης, 1886

Language: Greek

The excerpts used are from Constantinos Th. Dimaras, ed., *Κωνσταντῖνος Παπαρρηγόπουλος Προλεγόμενα* (Athens: Ερμής, 1983), pp. 71, 72, 90, 92, 93.

About the author

Constantinos Paparrigopoulos [1815, Constantinople (Istanbul) – 1891, Athens]: historian. During the persecutions following the outbreak of the Greek War of Independence, he lost his father and a number of his relatives, an experience which deeply traumatized him. Eventually, his family fled to Odessa. There, he studied at the Richelieu Lyceum. When he arrived in Greece, young Paparrigopoulos entered the administration. Soon, however, following a decision of the National Assembly in 1844 to remove from the administration all Greeks who were ‘heterochthones’ (i.e., who had not been born within the borders of the new state) he turned to history teaching and after being awarded a doctoral title in Munich went on to pursue an academic career. In the years 1851–1891 (from 1858 as a full professor) he taught ‘History of the Hellenic Nation’ at the University of Athens. Through his teaching activity he transmitted his ideas not only to his students, but also to a larger audience attracted by his rhetoric gifts and erudition. In particular, his introductory lectures each year were immediately published in the press. Paparrigopoulos considered his role as historian the fulfilment of a national duty. In consequence, he participated in meetings organized by nationalist societies, where he often gave the opening address, and he also delivered lectures abroad, often with government support. He was even invited to take part as a consultant at the Conference of Berlin in 1878. Apart from his voluminous intellectual contribution, Paparrigopoulos represents the type of the politically involved national historiographer, similar to **Mihail Kogălniceanu** or **František Palacký**. Politically minded historians in Greece since the 1970s, even if they rejected his attachment to a nationalist ideology, have considered his devotion to society as epitomizing the ideal of the historian’s vocation.

Main works: *Περί τῆς ἐποικίσεως σλαβικῶν τινῶν φυλῶν εἰς τὴν Πελοπόννησον* [On the settlement of certain Slav tribes in the Peloponnese] (1843); *Τό τελευταῖο ἔτος τῆς ἑλληνικῆς ἐλευθερίας* [The last year of Greek liberty] (1844); *Εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τοῦ ἑλληνικοῦ ἔθνους* [Textbook: the history of the Hellenic nation] (1853); *Εἰς τὴν γενικὴν ἱστορίαν* [Textbook of general history] (1849–52); *L'Église orthodoxe d'Orient. Réponse à M. Saint-Marc Girardin* (1853); *Les évolutions de l'histoire grecque à notre époque* (1879); *Ἱστορικαὶ πραγματεῖαι* [Historical essays] (1858); *Ἱστορία τοῦ ἑλληνικοῦ ἔθνους* [History of the Hellenic nation] (1860–74); *Ὁ μεσαιωνικὸς ἑλληνισμὸς καὶ ἡ στάσις τοῦ Νίκα, κατὰ τὸν κ. Παῦλον Καλλιγᾶ* [Medieval Hellenism and the Nikas uprising, according to Mr. Pavlos Kalligas] (1868); *Histoire de la civilisation hellénique* (1878); *Ὁ στρατάρχης Γεώργιος Καραϊσκάκης καὶ ἄλλα ἱστορικά ἔργα* [Field-Marshal Georgios Karaiskakis and other historical works] (1889).

Context

The concept of the ‘Hellenic’ state as elaborated in Western Europe presupposed that this was to be the heir to the ancient Greek (Hellenic) world. Since it occupied the same territory, and this territory had been liberated after the uprising of the Christian population claiming to be their descendants, it should—it was assumed—share the same culture and the same language as its ancient ancestors. Indeed, the newly born ‘Hellenic’ state originally based its legitimacy on this heritage. However, it had to undertake a difficult struggle to convince European public opinion of the validity of its claims. Moreover, the German historian Jacob Philip Fallmerayer argued that the ancient Greeks had been annihilated during the Slavic invasions of the Greek lands and the creation of new settlements in the seventh century AD. By this account, the so-called Neo-Hellenes were actually nothing more than a mixture of Slavic and Albanian populations. Not surprisingly, this theory disturbed the Romantic stream of European philhellenism. Yet it was at the same time a sop to European vanity, which found it hard to accept that these illiterate peasants were the descendants of the glorious Hellenic nation.

Thus, as Greek intellectuals soon realized, the Phoenix myth proved too weak to support a national ideology. For ‘Hellenism’ as a cultural discourse corresponded to the ‘revival’ of ancient Greece, which resulted in the inevitable rejection of all the in-between periods. The forgotten periods were treated now as ‘empty pages’ to be filled in. The silence was attributed to the religious prejudices of the Catholic West against Orthodox Byzantium, an argument which in turn nurtured the Orthodox anti-Western trends. There was an obvious need for a narrative to replace the one coming from abroad. It was the time for ‘real’ Greek history to be written.

A central issue was how to incorporate the different periods of the national past, a crucial stage in the construction of a national narrative whose essential theme was continuity. By far the most significant period here was the Byzantine era. Already in the 1850s Spyridon Zambelios had published two important works, a 'Collection of demotic songs' in 1852, and in 1857 the 'Byzantine studies: on the sources of neo-Hellenic nationality from the eighth until the tenth centuries AD., Zambelios wholeheartedly integrated the medieval period into Greek history. He argued that the origins of Neo-Hellenic nationality could be traced back to the Byzantine period. However, his emphasis was on its cultural formation. The key issue was the distinction between the two traditions of Hellenism, the scholarly and the popular. The argument went that the tradition of classical Hellenism was preserved and enriched in the West. In the 'enslaved' Greek lands, on the other hand, it was the spiritual tradition that was preserved in the popular culture. The concept of an uninterrupted popular culture thus served to reconcile the two contradictory components of modern Greek identity. Moreover, in his 'Byzantine studies,' Zambelios demonstrated how beneficial for both Hellenism and Christianity was their fusion in the Byzantine capital. This synthesis was illustrated in the cover illustration to his songs collection, where *klefts* (bandits) and priests, led by the last Emperor Constantinos Paleologos, were represented as participating in a combined assault to recapture Constantinople. The term *Ελληνοχριστιανικός* (Helleno-Christian) used to depict this interrelation probably constitutes Zambelios' most important contribution to the national canon.

By incorporating Zambelios' philosophical rather than historical conceptualization of the Byzantine period and the Helleno-Christian essence of the nation, Paparrigopoulos responded to the call for historical continuity in his life-work, the 'History of the Hellenic nation,' first published in a concise edition in 1853 and then in a series of volumes between 1861 and 1874. In this work he incorporated not only Byzantium but all the hitherto missing periods, identifying in an uninterrupted continuity of 4000 years five successive 'Hellenisms': the ancient, the Macedonian, the Christian, the medieval and the modern. Each of them was distinguished by its 'historical mission,' the vocation it received from Providence. Byzantium, however, bore particular importance, since it was considered to be the repository of Greek nationality. It had managed to unify the Greek nation and thus provide healing to the disunity of classical Hellenism, through an ideal territorial model which was supposed to encapsulate the historical destiny of Greece. As a matter of fact, in his 'History,' the Hellenic nation is no mere

abstract notion, but represented all populations which shared the same consciousness, both in the present and in the past. Particularly significant in his narrative is Paparrigopoulos' introduction of a powerful first person plural. This 'we' was not characterized by adherence to the same culture, but by its distinct mission. It is worth mentioning that, being an outsider, Paparrigopoulos felt personally the distinction between the indigenous elites of Athens and the newcomers who saw Constantinople as the historical center of Hellenism—the *autochthones* and *heterochthones* (see **Ioannis Kolettis**, *Of this Great Idea*). His claim for temporal continuity and spatial unity was at the same time a means of incorporating into the neo-Hellenic world all those who, like himself, originated from outside the Hellenic state. It is important to stress, however, that the young historian initially made his commitment to the nation-state. Therefore, in the first edition of his work, in 1853, he abided by the official ideology and supported the direct link of modern Greece with the ancient past. It was later that, due to both the political circumstances after the Crimean war and to his emancipation as a citizen and as a historian, he came to recognize the significance of Byzantium to Greek history.

The first enlarged edition of this work was completed between 1860 and 1872. In 1878 a short version, this time in two volumes, was published in French. In 1881 the first volume of the second edition of his 'History' was published. Since he had been criticized for not providing references and notes in the first edition, this time Paparrigopoulos gave his work a systematic scholarly format. The introduction to this volume under the title *Ιστορία τῶν ὀνομάτων Ἑλλήνες, Ἑλληνικό Ἔθνος, Ἑλληνισμός* (History of the names Hellenes, Hellenic Nation, Hellenism) had originally been his introductory lecture for the 1881 academic year. In this introduction, he deals with the trajectory of those terms from the ancient era up to the present time. Particularly significant is the use of the term 'Hellenism' as it had been introduced by the influential German historian, Johann Gustav Droysen, namely, in its double meaning both as a collectivity and as an assimilatory force. His final and main point is that Hellenism managed to survive for 4000 years but was diminished not only in terms of numbers but also in terms of internal strength. However, Hellenism always managed to maintain its integrity based on different components over time (language in Hellenistic times, religion in Byzantine and Ottoman times). Under the current circumstances, though, it "is persecuted more than ever" through the intimidation suffered by "our compatriots in the enslaved countries." Therefore, the introduction concludes, the role of the historian has become more

crucial, since he needs to provide Hellenes with “an exact knowledge of their true state.”

The tripartite scheme articulated by Zambelios and Paparrigopoulos has remained to this day the cornerstone of historical teaching and the prevailing public discourse. Moreover, it was influential and provided a model for the historiographical traditions of other Balkan nationalities. However, the place of the Byzantine period in the national historical canon became the focus of a heated dispute which split Greek intellectuals into two camps. On the one hand, there were the supporters of Byzantium, Orthodoxy and a pro-monarchical conservative ideology, with Paparrigopoulos as their prominent spokesman. On the other hand, there were the supporters of the ancient Greek heritage, the Enlightenment and liberal ideology, with the Byzantinist Pavlos Kalligas as their leading representative.

The difficult task of refuting Paparrigopoulos' synthesis would be attempted during the first decades of the twentieth century by Marxist historians (see **Georgios Skliros**, *Our social question*) who considered Paparrigopoulos as the ideological representative of the bourgeois class. In the 1960s the Marxist historian Nikolaos Svoronos took up the task of reconciling the notion of historical continuity proposed by the established historiography with the Marxist Left, which in his view did not employ a historical methodology. While accepting the continuity of Hellenism, he elaborated, however, on the notion of the ‘people’ rather than on the notion of the ‘nation.’ Thus, he did not advocate national continuity but rather an ethnic one, since he did not consider ethnicity a precondition for the articulation of national consciousness. It was only in the 1970s and 1980s, when the other dominant figure of Greek historiography of the period, Paparrigopoulos' biographer, Constantinos Th. Dimaras, paved the way and instigated a number of studies which aimed at deconstructing the historical continuity of the Greek nation.

VK

History of the Hellenic nation

Introduction

Nowadays, we make almost indiscriminate use of these names which in the past were not often synonymous, nor did they always coexist, nor did they always exist. When the nation was first formed, it bore the names Ar-

gives, Danaans, Achaïans.¹ The name Hellenes first became prevalent after the great change in things brought about by the Dorians. With the passage of time, the sum of the Hellenes was named the Hellenic nation, or simply the Hellenic, according to Herodotus and Thucydides, or the race of the Hellenes according to Aristotle. As for the word 'Hellenism,' it did not come into existence until Macedonian times, in order to denote the features by which the Hellenic nation as a whole was distinguished from other nations, that is to say, the one speaking the Hellenic language and living in a Hellenic way. Until recently, there was no word in any other language which was thus interpreted. It was only a few years ago that the words Germanism and Slavism, having some such meaning, were heard in Eastern Europe, while words of similar form have hitherto signified only idioms in the languages of the Western nations.

Beginning in the fourth century AD., a different use was made of the words 'Hellenes' and 'Hellenism.' Hellenes referred to the pagans, and Hellenism to paganism. The inhabitants of the Hellenic lands were generally renamed Romans, or sometimes Greeks and Helladics,² while the ancient meaning of Hellenism remained unknown. This distortion of the former meaning continued until the tenth century, when the name 'Hellenes' began to regain its traditional meaning, while that of Hellenism was totally absent. But, instead of taking root, the name 'Hellenes' was also then forgotten. During the fifteenth century it disappeared again, being supplanted for a second time by the name Romans. The two names did not reappear again until the present century: Hellenes very early on, and Hellenism considerably later. This intermittent phase of our national names, while the nation never ceased to exist, is not found in any other people. For this reason, I thought it useful to assist many people to understand this centuries-old history, by summarizing and explaining in advance its unique features.

[...] If the kingdom of Greece, from the moment it was first founded, had behaved with due foresight and dexterity towards the races which it is currently opposing, things would have been much less difficult than they are today. At that time, the Bulgarians and Albanians were not yet dreaming of autonomy, and felt an affinity towards the Hellenic nation, which, having

¹ These are the names used by Homer to describe the subjects of the Mycenaean kingdoms who campaigned against Troy.

² The inhabitants of the Hellenic lands. The term was used in reference to the Hellenic state, which was juxtaposed unfavorably with the 'Hellenic' Diaspora, and was reprimanded as parochial and shortsighted.

benefited from this, could have easily appropriated those living in Epirus, Macedonia and Thrace. Besides this, Europe's main concern at the time was either to salvage the Ottoman state or to render autonomous the countries which comprised it, while now different plans are being plotted. Unfortunately, the kingdom, for fifty whole years, forgot the traditional command to use time well; and, what was worse, the first national assembly in Athens withheld any affection towards its fellow nationals and speakers of the Hellenic language, perceiving them as foreigners, and not as brothers who had suffered all manner of ills in the common struggles. Amidst this inertia and lack of will, there appeared the 'Great Idea' of Ioannis Kolettis,' instead of which 'Hellenism' was soon to prevail. The word 'Hellenism' had regained its earlier status within the scholarly world, between 1833 and 1843, by virtue of Droysen's famous works, *Geschichte Alexanders des Grossen* and *Geschichte des Hellenismus*. But in the language of the many it did not enter until later, when, after the political crisis of 1853 onwards, it spread throughout the East, as if to protest that the Hellenic nation is not limited to the narrow boundaries of free Greece.

Modern Hellenism is very different from ancient Hellenism. In the first place, its distinguishing features are not identical to those of its past form. The Hellenic nation today is separated from the other countries neither by its religion, nor by its institutions, nor by its way of life. Its religion is common to that of most of the Eastern peoples, while its institutions are common to most of those of the West. And such a way of life is more fitting today to the most civilized part of the human race. Of its old endowments, the nation has only preserved its language and its consciousness of national unity; but it has acquired something it did not possess in ancient times, and that is the desire for political unity. It is understood that modern Hellenism does not demand to appropriate other races and other countries. It restricts itself to saving its fellow nationals from the threat of incursions by those of other races in countries which have belonged to Hellenism for a century. But if it is stated thus, that the Hellenic state does not covet the lands of other races, why use the term Hellenism, since, as we have often said, it is not necessary except as regards its propagation to those of other races? Because the Greeks are still divided into those who are free and those who are not free. Hence, in its political sense, the term Hellenic nation could be limited only to the inhabitants of the free state. Because of this it was deemed necessary to express by the same term, unambiguously, the moral and spiritual unity of a politically split nation.

[...]

Whatever may be the trials which the Hellenic nation is destined to suffer, its duty is to stand ready to wage war at the necessary time; and, meanwhile, it must save the Hellenes of the enslaved countries from the machinations continually taking place against them, because experience has shown that, if they are left to their own devices, they will be in the worst danger, while, if Hellenism suffers this new mutilation, it will lose any right it has over those countries. The material prosperity towards which the nation is working with especial zeal is, of course, a necessary factor for political greatness. But do not forget that, by virtue of the gigantic struggle which was carried out ten years ago between two of the most powerful and most civilized states on earth,³ the world has been given new proof that now, as in the past, the treasures of Croesus⁴ do not suffice for the salvation of nations.

The historian does not draft political programs, but he does use the past to infer lessons which may prove useful to the politician. And even though these findings are distressing, it is necessary for us to summarize them, because the first condition for the salvation of nations is an exact knowledge of their true state. Hellenism only stayed afloat for close to four thousand years by discarding at intervals part of this load in the stormy seas which threatened to sink it. It was thus reduced not only in its numbers, but also in its internal strength. Besides this, although Roman rule did not try to latinize it, and Ottoman rule did not try to islamize it, Hellenism today is being fought against in the enslaved Hellenic countries as never before, by numerous races and empires which may disagree among themselves, because each has its own political goal, but they are linked by one common interest to render distant the ancient occupant. And if that is what they are doing now, then it is obvious that in the event that they come to power, our fellow nationals will suffer the fate suffered a few decades ago by the flourishing Hellenic communities of Hungary, Wallachia and Moldavia. The names Hellenes, Hellenic nation and Hellenism will become limited to the southernmost end of the great peninsula. But even this tiny corner will not escape various machinations, because, as small as it may be, it occupies certain vital locations in the eastern Mediterranean. Thus, the final conclusion is that the fate of Hellen-

³ Paparrigopoulos refers to the Franco-Prussian war of 1870–1871 which ended with a devastating French defeat.

⁴ King of ancient Lydia, symbol of wealth and the arrogance that this might incite.

ism will be at great risk if it does not fight for its unity at any cost. The structure will either become one or it will collapse. And let us not perceive this necessary struggle as being hopeless, but bear in mind that he who is ready to do battle usually finds allies or at least achieves favorable terms, and above all remember what took place in this very land and in this very sea only sixty years earlier.⁵

Translated by Mary Kitroeff

⁵ He refers to the Greek War of Independence (1821–1829).

JOVAN JOVANOVIĆ ZMAJ: BRIGHT GRAVES, GRANDFATHER AND GRANDSON

Title: *Svetli grobovi* (Bright graves), *Ded i unuk* (Grandfather and grandson)

Originally published: *Svetli grobovi* was read on the grave of Djura Jakšić, a famous poet of the time; it was first published in 1881

Language: Serbian

Excerpts are from the modern edition: *Mala pevanija* (Beograd: Dečja knjiga, 1956), pp. 51–55, 172.

About the author

Jovan Jovanović Zmaj [1833, Újvidék (*Srb.* Novi Sad), – 1904, Kamanc (present-day Sremska Kamenica)]: physician, writer, journalist and editor. He was born into the family of a lawyer in Novi Sad. After finishing primary school in his home town, he attended the Gymnasium in Halas and Pozsony (*Ger.* Pressburg; today Bratislava, Slovakia) and studied law in Pest, Prague and Vienna. However, he did not finish his studies and continued his career working in the local administration in Novi Sad. In 1863 he was appointed director of Thökölyanum, a Serbian educational foundation in Pest, where he also continued his studies in medicine. Finally, he returned to Novi Sad in 1870 as a graduate in medicine. He worked as a physician for the rest of his life, often changing positions and places of residence. Apart from his medical practice, Zmaj engaged in publishing activity. He wrote, edited and published newspapers and magazines: *Javor* (literary), *Zmaj* (politico-satirical), *Žiža* (satirical), *Starmali* and *Neven* (for children). He also translated and adapted poetry, most notably from Hungarian. Close to the metre of folk songs, Zmaj's poetry gained great popularity among the reading public. His lyric poetry expresses a feeling of oneness with his wife, children, and extended family—and in an even broader sense with the entire Serbian nation and with humankind. His political sympathies in the 1860s and 1870s were on the side of liberalism and the 'United Serbian Youth' (*Ujedinjena omladina srpska*), and this political context heavily influenced his poetry. During the 1860s, together with **Svetozar Miletić**, he was a prominent figure of the intellectual-political circle in Vojvodina. Later on, after the splits in the Serbian Liberal Party, his political loyalties often shifted, but his poetic works remained under the influence of Romanticism, coupled with the social and religious ideas of Tolstoy.

Main works: *Đulići* [Roses] (1864); *Pevanija* [Song book] (1879); *Đulići uveoci* [Withering roses] (1882); *Snohvatice* [Dream land] (1895, 1900); *Čika Jova srpskoj omladini* [Uncle Jova to the Serbian youth] (1901).

Context

Together with Đura Jakšić and Laza Kostić, Jovan Jovanović Zmaj is one of the most important figures of Serbian romantic literature. He was also politically engaged, sympathizing with the ideas of the ‘United Serbian Youth,’ a movement which attracted a number of influential figures in Serbian public life in the period of the 1860–1870s. These included the politicians **Svetozar Miletić**, **Svetozar Marković**, **Jevrem Grujić**; the historians Stojan Novaković, Vasa Pelagić; and the political writer Vladimir Jovanović. The prominent literary critic, **Jovan Skerlić** (1877–1914), went so far as to argue that the whole of Serbian romantic literature, which also includes Laza Kostić, Milorad P. Šapčanin, Čedomilj Mijatović, Vladimir Vasić, **Draga Dejanović** and others, arose within the intellectual and ideological circle of the ‘United Serbian Youth.’

The poem ‘Bright graves’ seeks to construct a normative image of the Serbian national past in the romantic key, turning the motif—prevalent in Orthodox Christianity—of sacred graves, conferring sacredness on the land in which they lay, into the core of a ‘national’ identity-discourse. It speaks of the promise of the descendants to continue what their ancestors began, the continuous sacrifice of many generations for the noble cause, and a hard but glorious past which helps new generations to find the right path into the future. The examples handed down by venerable ancestors teach the new generations noble ideals. Zmaj therefore does not depict the graveyard as a place for the dead but as a cradle of a new life, the root of the nation, as it were. ‘Bright graves’ was specially written in honour of Zmaj’s friend, the romantic poet and painter, Đura Jakšić, just after his death. It evokes the cycle of life, the passing of generations, and a strong feeling of belonging to the community that unites all its members whether dead or alive. The grave becomes a powerful metaphor of tradition, honor and trans-generational solidarity.

The poem ‘Grandfather and grandson’ has a simpler symbolic message. Its central motif and metaphor of the glorious past is the *gusle* (an archaic string instrument) – the accompaniment of epic songs, the carrier of tradition. In the poem the grandfather sings to his grandson about heroic battles and demands from the boy, who does not understand the symbolism of the performance, to

kiss the *gusle* and pay respect to it. The poem focuses on the motif of supra-personal temporality, epitomizing the central value of the folk spirit as a source of national rebirth based on the strength of the people, featuring its values, its culture and its institutions as a vital and authentic cultural and political force. As a trope, the *gusle* epitomizes the need for independence and national consciousness. It was a key symbol in the work of **Vuk Karadžić** and **Petar Petrović Njegoš** and the title of Prosper Mérimée's famous poetic mystification of Serbian epic poetry, *La Guzla* (1827). As Vladimir Jovanović, a leading liberal politician and ideologist of the United Serbian Youth, put it in his work, 'For the freedom and the nation' (*Za slobodu i narod*, 1868), they are "symbols of freedom." You should not play the *gusle*, but as an "instrument of freedom": it should be kept "in every Serbian home" and "in acknowledged and public Serbian companies." Had they forgotten the *gusle*, the Serbs might have forgotten their freedom too. As a matter of fact, the popularity of Zmaj's poems is due to the institutionalization of 'national culture': for a long time they—particularly the first one, 'Bright graves'—were part of the school curricula and had to be recited, fostering thereby patriotic feelings and sense of national continuity.

IE

Bright graves

(First recited at a meeting organized by students of the higher Belgrade grammar school on 25 January 1879, in honor of the family of Đura Jakšić)

Have you been, my young brethren,
 Have you ever been to a graveyard,
 To a large graveyard?
 – Well, we are always in a graveyard.
 The earth we walk on is a graveyard;
 The water we sail on is a graveyard;
 Yards and gardens are graveyards;
 Hills and valleys are graveyards,
 Each foot
 Grave next to grave.
 The monument of all times is a graveyard;
 The books we read are a graveyard;
 The history book of all lands,

Of the olden emperors, kings,
 And the obituary of higher images
 Of the chosen ones, of martyrs,
 From as far back as memory goes;
 It's all a graveyard –
 But a cradle too.

There is no name and no number
 For all the stars high above,
 And even less can there be number and remembrance
 For the graves in the dear earth!
 Millions were swallowed by darkness,
 The pitch darkness of many a millennium,
 Nobody remembers them still,
 – But a candle always burns for some of them.
 It is either a candle, or the name is bright,
 Or the deeds are ever-burning,
 So that they adorn with their rays
 The rows of the endless cemetery.
 These graves,
 Old, new,
 They shine
 For every generation –
 When minds get engrossed in the past
 For them not to get lost in the darkness;
 When you plunge into the holy ancient times,
 Both holy and cursed ancient times,
 For your thought not to get you off your way.
 They are harbinger fires,
 Which reach from distant eons
 In that long procession –
 Shining a light for one another
 With a stream which flows forth,
 Striving toward a single goal, –
 And so the bright beams
 And so the bright traces
 Of a *single* spirit of *various* ages,
 A spirit which has no grave.
 – It merely chucks the bones into the grave,

Shakes off the ashes which impede it.
 For a faster progress, higher flight
 Toward an elevated future.
 He who turns around to look
 With a clear eye and sight
 At these bright graves,
 History books in a long succession,
 He must hear how,
 Through centuries, through mist,
 Grandfather to grandson, father to son,
 Warrior to warrior
 Loudly cried:
 'Where I stopped – you will go!'
 'What I couldn't – you will do!'
 'Where I couldn't – you'll arrive!'
 'Whatever we owe – you pay it off!'
 These are the words, these are the voices,
 Which adorn the past,
 Which penetrate through the world of darkness
 From those shining graves,
 Binding with a thunderous roar
 And with a divine force,
 Binding centuries together
 And binding man with man.
 [...]

Grandfather and grandson

The grandfather took his grandson,
 Sat him on his lap,
 And sang to him to the accompaniment of the gusle
 Of what had once been.

He sang to him of Serbian glory
 And of Serbian heroes,
 He sang to him of fierce battles,
 Of many a hardship.

The grandfather's eye glowed,
So he shed a tear,
And he told his grandson
To kiss the gusle.

The child kissed the gusle
And then asked with interest,
'Tell me, grandpa; Why did I
kiss that gusle?'

'You do not understand, you little Serb –
Us old folk, we know;
When you've grown up, when you've thought it out,
You'll see for yourself!'

Translated by Vedran Dronjić

IVAN VAZOV: UNDER THE YOKE

Title: *Под узомо* (Under the yoke)

Originally published: First separate edition in Sofia, 1894. English translation: London, William Heinemann, 1894.

Language: Bulgarian

The excerpts used are from *Under the yoke*. A new and revised edition (London: William Heinemann, 1911), pp. 200–204. No information is given as to the identity of the translator.

About the author

Ivan Vazov [1850, Sopot (Balkan valley) –1921, Sofia]: poet, novelist, and playwright. He came from a wealthy merchant family from Sopot. He studied in Sopot and in Kalofer with Botio Petkov, the father of **Hristo Botev**, and worked for some time as his assistant. It was there that his literary interests were formed (under the influence mainly of French literature – Béranger, Hugo and Lamartine). He spent the early seventies of the nineteenth century in Romania, where he became involved with Bulgarian revolutionary circles. This period of his life had a decisive role for the formation of his patriotic position. In 1875 he joined the revolutionary committee in Sopot, but after the end of the uprising in 1876 he emigrated again to Romania. In 1880, after the liberation of Bulgaria, Vazov moved to Plovdiv, the capital of the ephemeral autonomous principality of Eastern Rumelia which in 1885 was united with the Bulgarian principality, where he engaged in political activity. This was also the period when some of his most important literary works were published. In 1886, under the regime of Stefan Stambolov, he was forced to leave Bulgaria due to his Russophilism and moved to Odessa, where he wrote his novel ‘Under the yoke’ (1889), which became internationally renowned. After the fall of the regime of Stambolov he returned to Bulgaria and lived in Sofia from 1889 until his death. From 1897 to 1899 he was Minister of Education. After the turn of the century, Vazov was considered to be the ‘living patriarch of Bulgarian literature.’ He was the main mediator between the romanticism of the ‘National Revival’ and the institutionalization of the national ideology in the modern state. He was self-conscious of the symbolic value of his literary work and reacted, as a ‘voice of the people,’ to all important historical events in the first half-century of the existence of the independent Bulgarian state. He embodied the paradigmatic figure of the ‘national classic.’ His main model was probably Victor Hugo and, indeed, the range of Vazov’s work is quite similar to Hugo’s; spanning almost all literary genres, he completed and stabilized the elabora-

tion of the modern genre system in Bulgarian literature. Together with Hristo Botev, he was the main architect of the Bulgarian ‘national mythology’ (the main difference being that Botev’s poems were used retrospectively in its construction, while in Vazov’s case it was a conscious project of the artist). Next to Botev, Ivan Vazov is one of the most influential authors in modern Bulgarian literature.

Main works: *Поля и гори* [Fields and woods] (1884); *Повести и разкази* [Novels and short stories] 3 vols., (1891–1893); *Под игото* [Under the yoke] (1894); *Хъшове* [Vagabonds] (1894); *Нова земя* [New land] (1894); *Под нашето небе* [Under our sky] (1900).

Context

‘Under the yoke’ is the most famous Bulgarian novel both in Bulgaria and abroad. It commemorates the April Uprising of 1876, the culmination of the Bulgarian revolutionary movement. After Vasil Levski’s death in 1873, the BRCC (Bulgarian Revolutionary Central Committee) continued preparations for a national uprising and, using the structure of revolutionary committees established by Levski, formed a well-organized and centralized conspiratory network, divided into four regions. The most active of these was the Balkan valley region (and, more generally, Southern Bulgaria), which also played a crucial role during the whole ‘National Revival’ period. The uprising broke out in Koprivshitz, one of the main villages in that region, on the 20th of April 1876, earlier than had been planned because of fears of being exposed, and was completely crushed in less than two months by the Ottoman army and paramilitary troops. The violence of the ensuing reprisals provoked strong indignation all over Europe (including from some of the most influential European intellectuals—Victor Hugo, Fyodor Dostoevski, Ivan Turgenev, Oscar Wilde, and Charles Darwin). The Russian-Ottoman war that followed resulted in the creation of an autonomous Bulgarian state.

Vazov’s novel is one of the crucial texts on the uprising, and transformed this dramatic historical event into a national myth. His earlier ‘Epic of the Forgotten,’ glorifying the leaders of the uprising and the people who rose in revolt, and the famous ‘Notes on the Bulgarian revolts’ (1884–1892) by Zahari Stoyanov, himself an active participant in the insurrection, opened the way to the canonization of the uprising as a sacrificial founding event. These three texts served as a paragon of the national ideology, in which the myth of national martyrdom in the April Uprising acquired a constitutive function. Stoyanov himself said of the uprising: “We possess no other more glorious past that characterizes us as people.” This sentence resumes in the most la-

conic way the established reading of the uprising, which was shared even by those who criticized the underlying motives of the conspirators. As a major identity-building event, the uprising also became a bone of contention of different ideologies. The main strain of interpretation remained the one promoted by Vazov and Stoyanov, which considered the event as a quintessential emanation of the national self (heroism and martyrdom). This is obvious in the work of the leading figure of Bulgarian modernism, **Pencho Slavejkov**, who wrote an epic poem dedicated to the April Uprising ('Bloody song,' 1911–13), in which he aimed to transform the romantic myth into a modernist type of 'national ontology.' At the same time, however, already in the late-nineteenth century, the uprising was being critically examined by authors like Konstantin Velichkov (Vazov's closest collaborator) and Todor Vlajkov. A specific version of this critical attitude was championed by Marxist critics, starting with Dimitar Blagoev in the 1890s and culminating in the Marxist sociologist Ivan Hadzhijski's important work on the April Uprising (see **Ivan Hadzhijski**, *Optimistic theory of our people*).

'Under the Yoke' creates an epic fictional representation of this crucial episode in modern Bulgarian history. Boicho Ognyanov, a Bulgarian revolutionary imprisoned in Anatolia, succeeds in escaping and comes back to Bulgaria, to the town of Biala Cherkva (White Church) in the Balkan valley. There he is integrated step by step into the life of the community, which is represented in several bifurcations of the main plot. His aim is to lead the organization of the national revolution. Finally, the uprising bursts out but its result is a tragic catastrophe: the leaders of the movement perish, and so at the end of the novel do Ognyanov and his beloved Rada. Chapter VII, 'A nation intoxicated,' is a crucial ideological digression by the author. It is an attempt to devise a canon of 'national revival,' starting with the cultural nationalism of Paisij Hilendarski, the author of 'Slavo-Bulgarian History' (1762), and culminating in an armed uprising. Turning to the events of 1876, the chapter depicts revolutionary enthusiasm at its climax. The whole nation emerges as a homogeneous, organic, ecstatic and sacrificial body, in which the different social strata have disappeared, effaced by the force of the common 'madness': the will to freedom, or to autonomous national existence. The metaphor of 'madness' represents the epitome of the ideological pathos of the novel.

A nation intoxicated

In truth, as spring went on, the revolutionary movement made giant strides. The whole of Western Thrace, where the excitement was most general, resembled a huge volcano, the dull rumbling of which announced the coming eruption. A stream of apostles and agitators traversed mountain and plain and organised the contest. Everywhere they met with the same welcome—everywhere arms were opened to receive them, hearts to absorb their words—the whole nation thirsted after the stirring language of freedom, and was impatient to bear its cross to the new Golgotha. A long list of workers had already prepared the soil, and had even sown there the seeds of a love for freedom. These workers, beginning from Paissi,¹ a monk, and ending with Levski, a deacon—both saints—had sown and watered the field; the former had shed upon it his blessing from Mount Athos, the latter from the gallows. Twenty years before, Rakovski² had ventured in a village to advocate the revolt—he had to fly for his life, disguised in woman's dress, from the fury of the villagers. Now, when villagers heard that an apostle was coming, they sent out deputations to welcome him and herald his approach. They listened, they swallowed thirstily every word of that life-inspiring speech, even as the parched throat does the refreshing draught. In response to the appeal, “Be ready, we must die!” the church gave its pope, the school its teacher, the field its ploughman, the mother her son. The idea struck its roots everywhere with invincible force—it spread over all alike—over Balkan and valley, over the hut of the poor shepherd and the cell of the monk. Even the chorbadjis,³ who formed a close caste opposed to all national development, even these fell under the sway of the idea with which every brain was on fire. True, they took a comparatively small part in the patriotic movement, but they did not hinder it, for they did not betray it. Treachery and baseness were rife enough later, but after the catastrophe, as always happens in such cases. In vain would cer-

¹ The monk Paisij Hilendarski (1722–1773) is the author of the famous ‘Slavo-Bulgarian History’ [История славеноболгарская] (1762). He is considered in modern Bulgarian historiography as the first important figure of the ‘Bulgarian national revival.’

² Georgi S. Rakovski (1821–1867), Bulgarian poet, writer and revolutionary activist.

³ Bulgarians, or Christians in general, who enjoyed high social standing and whose main function was to mediate in social, administrative and fiscal terms between the Ottoman authorities and the local Christian population.

tain writers, blinded by party spirit, seek to claim a monopoly of patriotic ardour only for the sheepskin clad and shod peasant, in defiance of historical truth. No, the revolutionary spirit, like a flaming seraph, spread its wings over peasant and university student—kalpak and fez,⁴ priest's cap and tall hat alike. As in all the progressive struggles of Bulgaria, science and the cross were in the front rank. The martyrology of modern Bulgarian history proclaims this truth. True, the principal contingent, as at all times, was furnished by the mass of the people. But it gave what it could—that is, numbers. Thought and soul could only be supplied by the intelligence. So the effervescence increased daily and spread over everything. Every day it assumed greater dimensions and acquired fresh strength. The preparations went on with unrelenting ardour; young and old displayed equal zeal. The peasants left their fields untilled to cast bullets, the citizens neglected their business. Secret posts went day and night between the different committees and the central committee at Panagioturishte; young lads spent the day in drilling with their guns, under the command of centurions and decurions; the women knitted stockings, made cartridges, and baked biscuit; the bootmakers worked only at knapsacks, cartridge cases, military boots and such revolutionary gear; even the village mayors, vekils, and other local functionaries eagerly took part in the preparations. In every village the depot of arms, bullets and gunpowder grew larger daily—the gunpowder was supplied by the Turks themselves—cherry-trees, hollowed out, planed, and fitted with iron hoops, formed the artillery. The silken standard embroidered with lions, fancifully braided uniforms, bright ecclesiastical vestments, and crosses were the adornments of the impending contest. The influence of this general infatuation was felt even in the children's games: tops, hoops, kites were left for the more thrilling joys of playing at soldiers with wooden swords and guns. The old people, amazed, said it was a visitation of God. In truth, it was the only divine manifestation by which people were persuaded to join in the movement, if we except the miraculous logogram, "Turkey will fall—1876," which spread rapidly abroad and convinced the most sceptical. That year, spring was extraordinarily early: the whole of Thrace resembled the Garden of Paradise. The rose-gardens were one mass of scented bloom, more luxuri-

⁴ 'Kalpak' is the traditional peasant hat; 'fez' is the typical Ottoman cap, which in this context appears as sign of the relative integration of the Christian elite in the Ottoman administration.

ant than ever before or since. Field and vineyard alike promised miraculous harvests, destined, alas! to rot unreaped.

As for the inaction of the Turkish Government, in face of such open and unconcealed agitation, such boisterous preparations for the revolt, it is to be explained only by their blindness and utter contempt of the despised raya. "They're merely hares at play," said the complacent Effendis. "They're only the Hurrahers...",⁵ said the haughty rulers, smiling grimly and contemptuously. There are words which mark an epoch. The "Hurrahers" were the expression of the awakening of the nation when it emerged victorious from the thirty years' struggle for its ecclesiastical autonomy. But the hurrahers who saluted with their cheers the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate in 1870 had in 1876 become revolutionaries, and prepared bullets and cannons to welcome Bulgarian liberty.

The Turks, however, could not discern the change: they were unable to march with the times or to see the progress in the ideas of the people. Indeed, if they had understood, it was now too late—their dungeons were not vast enough, their fetters too short, to curb the gigantic idea, the invisible "King Marko"⁶ lurking in the mountains.

Posterity will be astonished—nay, the very contemporaries of the age, with a whole series of historical examples before them, stand aghast before this moral intoxication, this sublime infatuation of a people preparing to contend with a mighty empire still great in its military resources—preparing with the hope, too, of victory, and with such means, ineffectual even to a point of ridicule, ready to take the field in the very "jaws of hell," as Marko Ivanoff had said not long before, without seeking for any ally save its own enthusiasm—a will-o'-the-wisp, which flames and dies out, a phantom, an illusion. History has but rarely furnished an example of such self-confidence—verging on madness. The Bulgarian national spirit has never risen to such heights, and may never again reach them.

Especial attention has been devoted to this prelude of the struggle, for it alone is striking, and may be taken as the example of a great idea fostered in

⁵ An allusion to the boisterous crowds whose loud acclamations heralded the establishment of the Exarchate and the liberation of the Bulgarian Church from Greek domination in 1870. The Turkish expression is 'Dajiveijilerdendir' from 'Dajivei,' the Bulgarian 'Hurrah!' (translator's note).

⁶ Popular semi-legendary hero. He is described in a translator's note as a 'Bulgarian King Arthur.'

a fertile and favorable soil. The struggle itself by which it was followed was unworthy of the very name.

Nor will it be described in these pages. The story is naturally taken up with a single episode of the contest, which follows later, and which gives a glimpse of the revolution, that utter downfall of the brightest hopes.

Anonymous translator

NAMIK KEMAL: OTTOMAN HISTORY

Title: *Osmanlı Tarihi* (Ottoman History)

Originally published: Istanbul, Mahmud Bey Press, 1910

Language: Ottoman Turkish

The original Ottoman text was used for the translation provided in this volume (pp. 1–49). *Osmanlı Tarihi* was republished in modernized Turkish form in 1971 by Hürriyet Yayınları, Istanbul.

About the author

Namık Kemal [1840, Tekirdağ (Rumelia) – 1888, Chios (*Tur.* Sakız)]: journalist, writer and bureaucrat. The son of the court astrologist, Namık Kemal received a thorough education in traditional Islamic studies and was exposed to Islamic mysticism as well as popular poetry. He also travelled extensively in the early years of his life. In 1858, he joined the Translation Bureau of the foreign ministry, a seedbed of the most progressive minds of the Tanzimat, where he learned French. At this period, he also came into contact with romantic French literature, Enlightenment political philosophy and social sciences. In 1862, Namık Kemal started writing in the *Tasvir-i Efkar* (Account of Opinions), which was among the earliest non-official Turkish newspapers published by the eminent intellectual **İbrahim Şinasi**. He soon became the intellectual figurehead of the first (yet loosely organized) modern political opposition, the Young Ottoman movement in the 1860s. He fled to Europe in 1867, where he edited the newspaper entitled *Hürriyet* (Liberty) which acted as an organ of the Young Ottoman opposition. Namık Kemal returned to Istanbul in 1870, but was exiled to Cyprus in 1873. In 1876, following the deposition of Sultan Abdülaziz by a military coup, he was recalled to help draw up the first Ottoman constitution. Yet, shortly after the promulgation of the 1876 constitution, the new sultan, Abdülhamid II, banished him again, this time to the island of Lesbos. He served as governor in Lesbos, Rhodes and Chios until his death in 1888. Namık Kemal's career reflects the transformation of a believer in Enlightenment political ideals into a fiery romantic nationalist. While his initial orientation was towards grounding a theory of natural rights and representative political institutions in Islam, through the 1870s and 1880s he was fully engaged in forging a Muslim Ottoman identity through works of history and biographies of old heroes. A prolific writer, Kemal produced works in almost all genres of literature, including novels and plays that were amongst the first of their kind in Turkish. He was a revolutionary figure in the development of Turkish prose, going far beyond his precursors in using the vernacular language, and writing

with a powerful style devoid of the circumlocutions of nineteenth-century written Turkish.

Main works: *Devr-i İstila* [Age of Invasion] (1867); *İntibah* [Awakening] (1873); *Vatan yahud Silistre* [Fatherland, or Silistra] (1873); *Kanije* (1874); *Gülñihal* (1875); *Cezmi* (1880); *Celaleddin Harzemşah* (1881); *Tahrib-i Harabat* [Destruction of debris] (1886); *Osmanlı Tarihi* [Ottoman history] (1910); *Renan Müdafaaamesi* [Reply to Renan] (1910).

Context

While drafting his major work on Ottoman history, the *Osmanlı Tarihi*, the Young Ottoman apostle Namık Kemal revealed in a letter to one of his friends that his current intellectual preoccupation was “not literature itself but investigation,” through which, he claimed, he was “reconstituting Ottoman history.” Indeed the period known as the *Tanzimat* witnessed a gradual transformation in the Ottoman practice of history writing whereby the novel standards of ‘objectivity’ and documentary accuracy were eagerly espoused by a new generation of Ottoman authors. In fact, the task of “reconstituting” Ottoman history to which Namık Kemal alluded not only pertained to the novel investigative procedures he claimed to have observed himself, but also to an altogether new role assigned to the discipline of history. With the advent of modern historiography, the predominantly dynastic framework of Ottoman history was expanded to fit the new demands of the *Tanzimat*’s peculiar ideology of ‘dynastic nationalism.’ The new historical narrative, nurtured above all by the proliferation of textbooks prepared for the new secular institutions of learning, helped define and legitimize the idea of a continuous and progressive Ottoman nationhood in history whose terms of collective identity were, nevertheless, generated and safeguarded under the infallible dominance of the dynastic entity.

Namık Kemal’s *Ottoman History* reveals the genuine concern of Late Ottoman historians with the novel comparative and analytical perspectives developed by their European counterparts. Kemal’s original plan was to supplement his major historical work with a prolegomena that would stand as a separate volume, entitled *Roma Tarihi* (Roman history). This study was intended to provide the Ottoman readers with an extensive overview of Roman, Byzantine and Early Islamic periods. What the author aimed at, in starting with such a broad and universal framework, was to situate the fourteenth-century beginnings of Ottoman civilization within its larger late medieval seedbed, delineating its cultural and political links with the Islamic and the Roman civilizations.

The publishing of Kemal's *Roman History* was interrupted on the orders of Sultan Abdülhamid II soon after the appearance of the first fascicule in 1887. The use of expressions such as "the enlightenment of opinions" by an author who was already in exile constituted sufficient cause for the severe Hamidian regime to confiscate the published fragment. Leaving the pre-Ottoman prolegomena project dormant, Namık Kemal spent the last months of his life revising the main body of his history which was to be published only after the deposition of Abdülhamid. Had his notes for the initial volume been published, it would have been fascinating to read Namık Kemal's rendition of classical and early medieval history as a backdrop to the advent of the Ottoman state. Nevertheless, the introduction to the published version of 'Ottoman history,' taken from the initial publication of the prolegomena, provides a general sense about the author's original intentions. It appears, from what Kemal had initially proposed, that a significant portion of the prolegomena would have been devoted to medieval Islamic states. This is hardly surprising, for Namık Kemal and other members of the nebulous Young Ottoman movement hoped to reinterpret the cultural content of Islam as a major component of national/dynastic identity in the Ottoman realm. For them, the Ottoman Empire was the major inheritor of the great Islamic civilization, the essential qualities of which, they believed, were fully compatible with the liberal norms of the modern world. Hence, a modern re-assessment of Islamic history was essential to Namık Kemal's project for unearthing the very roots of Ottoman culture and for re-examining the essential constituents of Ottoman identity in its distant origins. Still, notwithstanding the proposed emphasis on Islamic history, Kemal's agenda of contextualizing the medieval roots of Ottoman civilization with an articulate view of the classical past is noteworthy, as it carries an understanding of a shared historical setting for the entire Euro-Mediterranean world.

In its published form, Namık Kemal's 'Ottoman history' covers a period extending from the emergence of the Ottoman state to the reign of Mehmed II. Kemal's treatment of the formative stages of the Ottoman state articulates the proto-nationalistic myth of "creating an empire out of a clan," which was to become a dominant trope in late Ottoman history writing. In the initial chapter, the story of the *Kayı* tribe, a branch of the Turkmen Oghuz people that constituted the kernel of the Ottoman dynasty, is traced back to its obscure origins in Central Asia. Yet, it is clear from the brevity of the section on the pre-Anatolian past that Kemal's vision of national origins is indexed firmly to the advent of the Ottoman dynasty. Certainly recognized to be Turkish, the Asian Oghuz tribes are still not portrayed as comprising a national

entity in Kemal's work, since in his mind it was essentially the dynasty, and not ethnicity, that constituted the legitimate basis of national cohesion. Thus, in tandem with the rising tenor of "Ottomanist" ideology, the early rulers of the Ottoman state are cherished in the first chapters as the founders and the archetypal heroes of the Ottoman nation. The making of the Ottoman fatherland out of meagre beginnings is glorified by Kemal as an extraordinary feat attributable only to the military might, the political prowess, and high moral fibre of the founding fathers.

Inspired by the writings of the European Romantics (in particular, Victor Hugo), Namık Kemal's style is charged by a heavy dose of sentimentalism. His saga of national/dynastic achievement revolves around fervent narratives of military success and territorial expansion. As such, Kemal's treatment of '*millet*,' the Ottoman nation, quite openly privileges the dominant Muslim element, and his standard rendition of '*vatan*' (fatherland) is unmistakably colored by a strong Islamic sentiment. Two keywords, *hürriyet* (liberty) and *vatan* (fatherland), are generally considered to be his contributions to the Turkish political vocabulary. Both words were used earlier with a growing sense of their novel implications by certain Ottoman officials and intellectuals. Yet, Namık Kemal should be given credit in vastly popularizing these terms and investing them with their full range of modern connotations. In parallel with his immensely popular historical biographies, plays and novels, Namık Kemal adamantly portrays the Ottoman fatherland as a sacred domain that was won in the battlefield by a dynasty which safeguarded it under the banner of Islam. Unwilling to negotiate his dynastic-nationalist fervor and religious sentimentalism, the fiery leader of the Young Ottoman movement confronts the endemic dilemma faced by many Late Ottoman intellectuals who struggled to reconcile the dynastic-Islamic and secular-cosmopolitan definitions of Ottoman identity.

AE

Ottoman History

[from the *Introduction*]

[...]

I found it necessary to write a prolegomena before starting this history. The first section, therefore, constitutes an historical outline of the Roman Empire up to the emergence of Islam. Perhaps some readers will be wearied by the length of this introductory draft, but there was no way of condensing it

any further. Firstly, without the background of Roman history, it was impossible to expound upon the Eastern [Byzantine] Empire, which was constantly in touch and at war with Islamic states till its demise, as well as upon the Islamic state that was annihilated in Andalusia, and the force that blocked the routes of Islamic conquest in the West. Secondly, I wanted to provide the reader with a sound basis for comparing the Roman Empire, the greatest political entity before the advent of Islam, with the Arab empire. Unfortunately, a comprehensive study of the Roman Empire that would serve as a reference in this regard has never been published in our language. [...]

The prolegomena also includes lengthy sections on [medieval] Islamic states. This was necessary too, since there are very few translations in Turkish regarding the affairs of the Islamic states [...] [The existing literature] constitutes no more than a cursory overview of this period. The accounts these sources provide regarding Europe are either inadequate or entirely flawed. It would also be quite misleading to rely on information derived from this literature concerning the affairs of the sublime [Ottoman] state. [...]

In terms of our main area of interest, I dwelled extensively on Ottoman history whenever the sources were available. In each section, I tried to provide a brief overview on the history of other Islamic states so as to provide useful comparative insights. In terms of the particulars of non-Muslim states, I deemed it sufficient to recount the matters that were directly related to the Ottoman world.

I carried out extensive research on several Islamic sources and European histories. My humble investigations revealed that some of the most important facts about Ottoman history contradicted the fabricated accounts that enjoy popular acclaim. [...] I also included some personal considerations based on critical deliberation. I took utmost care, however, to withhold my personal point of view in the recounting of historical events. [...]

[from *The Advent of the Ottoman Dynasty*]

The seventh century of the Hegira [thirteenth century AD] started out as an ominous period of bloodshed for the Islamic world. The Crusades, which started in the sixth century, flowing south and destroying the fruits of civilization like a raucous flood [...] were crushed by the iron chest of Salah-al-din al-Ayyubi,¹ renowned as one of the great statesmen of human history.

¹ Saladin. Medieval Islamic hero of Kurdish origin (d. 1193) who fought against the Crusaders and established the Ayyubid dynasty.

[...] [On the other hand] Islamic Spain was tormented for centuries by the hellish flames of brutality. With great tact, only the Nasrid dynasty² was able to withstand these threats at a corner of Andalusia.

At the beginning of the seventh century, leading his army of terror, Chingiz Khan was wreaking havoc in Asia. [...] The holiest places of Islam and its luminous centers of learning vanished underneath towers of human bones and amidst the wooden icons of pagans. [...] The conversion of the Mongols to Islam at the end of the century was not enough to the reverse the state of decline that befell the realm of Islam. [...] As this century of evil cast one fifth of the world into flames and drowned it in its bloodbath, the crescent and star of the felicitous Ottoman state rose from the western bounds of Asia; this was a resplendent dawning that was to flood the Islamic world and the rest of humanity with the radiance of its blessings for many centuries to come. [...]

[from *Osman Bey*]

A number of historians trace Sultan Osman's lineage to Isaac, while others take it all the way back to Japheth, son of Noah. I see no point in elaborating such genealogies as they are entirely fictitious. Indeed, why would a sovereign figure like Osman require the pride and glory of the past, while his house formed one of the most superb and glorious dynasties of the world, secured the Caliphate and abounded with victors such as Mehmed the Conqueror, Selim and Süleyman. [...]

We can only attribute the astonishing success of the Ottoman state to the extraordinary virtues, the unwavering personal integrity and relentless labor of its founder Osman. Starting with a clan of four hundred that came from a distant corner of the world, the Ottoman Empire was thus able to turn into a formidable world power with a hundred million people; all in a matter of two centuries. ... Building his state in a land that has been inhabited by all the world-dominating nations witnessed by history, Sultan Osman displayed and benefited from all the merits bequeathed to him by the progeny of these nations. [...]

Illuminating his realm with the radiance of his justice [...] Sultan Osman secured the lives, property and dignity of his people against internal and ex-

² Established in Granada, the Nasrids (1230–1492) were the last Islamic dynasty in Spain.

ternal threats, and sought ways to clear a path of prosperity and progress for his nation. [...]

Among great empires, such as the Umayyads,³ the Abbasids⁴, Ghaznavids,⁵ Saljuks,⁶ Chingizids⁷ and Timurids,⁸ there is not one that has not fallen or been completely disarrayed in two hundred years. In stark contrast, alone the *rise* of the state founded by Osman lasted more than three hundred years. Considering his majestic virtues and feats, Sultan Osman must have been the only person in the entire history of humanity that possessed the capacity to undertake such a magnificent task.

Translated by Ahmet Ersoy

³ The first Islamic dynasty (seventh to eighth century), with its capital in Damascus.

⁴ The early Islamic dynasty following the Umayyads (eighth to thirteenth century), established in Baghdad.

⁵ A Turkic dynasty (962–1168) established in western Afghanistan which later expanded into Eastern Iran and Northwest India.

⁶ The Great Saljuks (1037–1157), a Turkic dynasty, originated in Northeast Iran. In 1055 they conquered the caliphal city of Baghdad. The Saljuks of Rum ruled from the Anatolian city of Konya between the early eleventh and the thirteenth centuries.

⁷ A Mongol dynasty founded by Chingiz (Genghis) Khan (r. 1206–1227) that ruled over Central Asia and parts of China.

⁸ A Turco-Mongol dynasty founded by Timur (Tamerlane) (r. 1370–1405) that originated in Central Asia and later ruled over Anatolia and Mesopotamia.

JOSEF JUNGSMANN: SECOND CONVERSATION CONCERNING THE CZECH LANGUAGE

Title: *O jazyku českém rozmlouvání druhé* (Second conversation concerning the Czech language)

Originally published: First published in *Hlasatel český* (The Czech Herald), no. 1, vol. III, 1806, Prague

Language: Czech

The excerpts used are from Felix Vodička, ed., *Josef Jungmann: Boj o obrození národa. Výbor z díla Josefa Jungmanna* (Prague: F. Kosek, 1948), pp. 31–50.

About the author

Josef Jungmann [1773, Hudlice (central Bohemia) – 1847, Prague]: linguist, translator, literary scholar, and lexicographer. He studied philosophy at Prague, where he was particularly interested in mathematics, physics, history and literature. In the humanities he was at first influenced by German professors, the historian Ignatz Cornova and the aesthetician A. G. Meissner. Later he attended the lectures of František Martin Pelcl on Czech language and literature, which shifted his interests toward national culture. After his studies he was hired to teach at a grammar school in Leitmeritz (Cz. Litoměřice) and later also in Prague. He married a wealthy Leitmeritz German woman and was granted burgher status in 1805. He became a leading member of his generation of Czech patriots, who radicalized their struggle for Czech cultural autonomy. Their main aim was to raise the Czech language to a level that would make it possible to use it to write modern works of literature. With his teaching and especially lexicographical activities, Jungmann was instrumental in this respect. Seeking to expand the Czech vocabulary he revived words from the old Czech literary language of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries and created neologisms on the basis of other Slavic languages, namely, Polish and Russian. With his masterful translations of Chateaubriand, Milton, Goethe and others into Czech, he laid the foundations of modern Czech poetic vocabulary. During the 1820s he gathered around himself a few younger intellectuals (F. L. Čelakovský, **Ján Kollár**, **František Palacký**, P. J. Šafařík) with whom he worked to realize, intellectually and institutionally, his ethno-linguistic national cultural program. He was engaged in most of the heated debates on the grammatical and orthographical codification of Czech. After the ‘discovery’ of allegedly ancient (but in fact forged) Czech manuscripts in 1818, Jungmann, who was convinced of their authenticity, drew important

conclusions regarding the historical roots of Czech literature in, for example, one of his major works, 'History of Czech literature.' This, together with the emphasis on the connection between academic activities and the nascent national ideology, became a source of personal and generational conflict between Jungmann and the authority of the previous generation, **Josef Dobrovský**. Jungmann's major accomplishment, however, was a five-volume Czech-German dictionary containing more than 120,000 headwords depicting the Czech lexical fund in a historically, geographically, and socially broad perspective. With the dictionary, Jungmann to some extent achieved his main goal, which was to elevate Czech to a modern tool of communication.

Main works: *Slovesnost aneb Sbírka příkladů s krátkým pojednáním o slohu* [Literature, or a collection of examples with a short treatise on style] (1820); *Historie literatury české aneb Soustavný přehled spisů českých, s krátkou historií národu, osvětlení a jazyka* [History of Czech literature, or an overview of Czech writing, with a short history of the nation, education, and language] (1825, 1845, 1846); *Slovník česko-nemecký* [Czech-German dictionary], 5 vols., (1834–39).

Context

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the new Romantic concept of 'nation' that was developed in Western Europe began to spread among Czech and Bohemian German elites. The ideas that appeared in German-speaking areas (Jakob Grimm, Friedrich Schlegel), treating the vernacular language as a stable community-building element (in contrast to the changing political order) and the only way to raise the education of humankind, naturally found fertile soil in Bohemia as well. This was supplemented by a new vision, emerging from the French Revolution, defining the nation as an entity unified by the quest for freedom.

Josef Jungmann was one of the most important representatives of the 'second' generation of Czech patriots, among whom language still evoked the greatest interest. Nevertheless, in comparison to the prevalently 'scholarly' interest of the former generation, Jungmann and his compatriots were much more enthusiastic about the Romantic ideas of language and nation, especially those inspired by Johann Gottfried Herder's approach, which demonstrated a high regard for the Slavonic nations and languages. In the atmosphere of a cultural 'revival,' primarily in verse, fiction, and drama, the Czech patriots developed their ideas of fatherland and nationhood, which went beyond the former concepts linked with the region and the estates. In turn, the fatherland came to be identified with the language and customs of the nation, that is to say, all people using the Czech language in contrast to the former 'political' nation of the nobility. Owing to the strong German cultural influ-

ence, the ethno-linguistic conception of the Czech nation was shaped by the organic theory of the nation developed in Germany (Johann Gottlieb Fichte, Ernst Moritz Arndt, Friedrich Ludwig Jahn). Subsequently, two approaches originated among Czech patriots. The moderate or 'utraquist' position (named after the moderate camp in the Hussite movement four centuries earlier) was based on the principle of tolerance between Czechs and Germans in Bohemia and was propagated by a circle of Czech and German teachers at Prague University (Jan Nejedlý, Johann Gustav Meinert, **Bernard Bolzano**). The second approach, represented by Jungmann and his followers, was more radical and egalitarian, though not necessarily hostile to the Germans.

In his first 'Conversation concerning the Czech language,' Jungmann lamented the condition of contemporary Czech in comparison to 'the golden age' of the language, that is, its humanist period in the sixteenth century. He concluded, however: "only the nation whose language has not completely died is still alive." In the second dialogue presented below, Jungmann turned his thoughts to the future prospects of the Czech language. In terms of genre, the 'Conversations' are still to be classified as an apology of the language cultivated in previous decades, yet they differ from the previous cases in the structure of argumentation. First, Jungmann compared the Czech and German national movements. Even though Czech culture was in an inferior position to the German, this did not necessarily mean the general inferiority of the Czech nation. As Jungmann argued, the Germans had been in a similarly inferior position towards the French a few decades earlier. Secondly, Jungmann applied the Herderian 'primordialist' conception of the nation that considered language a kind of incorporation of the national spirit, since it mirrored its character and customs. Thirdly, a new trait is evident in the structure of Jungmann's 'utilitarian argument.' The Czech language was to be preserved not primarily because the nobility needed it to communicate with the serfs, but because the 'common people' needed it. In this sense, Jungmann stressed the civic and democratic if not egalitarian element in the projected Czech nation-building process, which was a condition for subsequent mass propaganda.

Jungmann's 'Conversations' are generally perceived as an important moment in the evolution of ideas on the Czech language and on the use of the concept of 'nation.' It was widely interpreted as Jungmann's first draft of the 'national program.' Recent interpretations, however, tend to argue that national agitation was not Jungmann's prime intention. Indeed, there was no substantial response to his article for more than ten years. It was only in the 1820s that his linguistic concept of the nation found broader acceptance. In

subsequent years Jungmann came to be known as the ‘creator’ of the Czech national program and, later, a symbol of Czech nationalism. This was also why the critics of the integral nationalism of the 1890s (Tomáš G. Masaryk, Hubert G. Schauer) steered clear of Jungmann’s national cultural program.

MK

Second conversation concerning the Czech language

*Protiva:*¹ I was rather surprised that you of all people led the conversation away from the matter at hand to quite a different matter or, to put it more plainly, from love of country to love of the Czech language, which seemed ridiculous to me. [...]

Slavomil: [...] If I asked you what nation lived in Austria, you’d surely say, ‘Germans,’ just as you would allot France to the French, Russia to the Russians, and you would not deny that each of these nations has its own country. Well, what makes the French French, the Russians Russian or the Germans German?

Protiva: The fact that each has its own community and administration!

Slavomil: But what if all their lands were united under one administration? Wouldn’t the number of nations remain the same?

Protiva: There would be one community comprising Germans, Russians and French.

Slavomil: One community, but of different nations. Each of those nations would be delimited by itself, and I don’t think anybody could too easily persuade the Russian that France was his country. Although the French, the most cosmopolitan of cosmopolitans, who are at home everywhere, would not fail to glorify everything west of the Rhine as their country. And, so, where one administration, one code of law, and, let’s say, even one religion prevailed, where would the obvious distinction between these nations come from?

Protiva: I understand. You’re saying that language is what defines nations and their homelands.

[...]

In other words, there are as many nations as there are languages, and as many homelands as there are nations?

¹ The names of the speakers are significant. Slavomil suggests a person with pro-Slav sentiment, Protiva someone who is ‘against.’

Slavomil: Because one part of the Earth with its inhabitants would be called a country with separate rights in accordance with its language.

Protiva: Czechia is the part called Bohemia. And in Hungary there are at least three homelands, and what's so jolly about that is that they're all mixed up!

Slavomil: Go on, laugh as much as you like! That's the way it is. We are not arguing about a concept, but about the thing itself; and I think that if the Czech nation were Germanized or died out by any other means (may its spirit protect it from all Czech-haters and ward them off) the name Czechia would belong to this land as little as the name Bohemia belongs to it, since no Boii² have lived here for a very long time. [...] For if one could not imagine a homeland without a nation or a nation without its own language, I would again have to conclude that no one other than he who loves the language of his nation can boast of true love of his country.

[...]

Protiva: Although I myself doubt that one language, even if today some supernatural power were to put it on the lips of all nations, could endure long enough to avoid being divided up by a new Babel; nevertheless, I consider that if the Czech nation were Germanized it would not be detrimental to the glorious, wondrous variety of languages in the world and to the character of the nation; for not even the most sophisticated argument would persuade me that the same nation, if it changed its language, would be a different nation tomorrow from what it is today. But you must admit that something glittering about the Czech language caught your eye, making it impossible for you to consider that one language is like another. [...]

Slavomil: [...] Does not each nation have its own experience and manners? And isn't language like a repository of all human knowledge and arts, the wealth of which, just as in a family, passes from father to son? And what's more, language is a most excellent philosophy, formed by its particular geographic region, mores, mentality, inclinations and those thousands of other distinctions inherent in every nation. Consequently, as every effect has its cause, language, by its composition, sound and nature, constitutes the most reliable, most faithful picture of its inception, communal development, cultivation, character and customs. Thus, as a whole nation lives in one language, and expresses itself in it as a sign and evidence of its character, so in

² Boii (Bojové in Czech)—the name of a Celtic tribe which settled in the area of Bohemian basin in the last four centuries BC, from which the Latin name Bohemia also derived.

studying the language one learns about the nation, and that nation is distinguished from other nations as one man is distinct from another who has a different education and upbringing. And the true patriot, disregarding certain extreme philosophers, may therefore, without fear of lapsing into harmful prejudice, love any language of his nation; yes, I repeat, for some people cannot be told frequently enough, that without love for the language of one's country it is not possible to imagine love for the country, that is, love for the nation; and the Czech may therefore sing with great boldness: If we become Germans, we shall be a nation, but no longer Czechs! [...]

Protiva: [...] This conversation has become unexpectedly serious. Let it be, as you say, that Czechs remain Czechs only as long as they speak Czech: but, I ask you, what difference does it make whether they are Czech or German, as long as they are happy? Or don't you think that a German can be as happy as a Czech?

Slavomil: O, my dear Protiva, I wish you understood me better! After all, I'm not so dim as to hold that view. I respect Germans, as I do any other enlightened nation, and every Czech will be so just and acknowledge that, with respect to art and learning, we owe them at least as much as they themselves owe the French. How could I ever think that just because they are Germans they could not be happy, when I extol and love the thing that makes them happy, that is to say, scholarship and art? But whether the Czechs can be happy if their Germanization continues is truly another question. Consider that, and judge for yourself! A man who speaks only Czech is excluded from all offices, cannot be even a temporary clerk, but is instead condemned to the plough or the shoemaker's last of his forefathers as in the Egyptian captivity, whereas the puffed-up alien is employed in the administration of the land and enjoys the benefits of its prospering; for at great expense and effort he can acquire that German key to office in schools that are, to be sure, contaminated with the German language, but are still supremely suitable for extinguishing the last spark of Czech intelligence. [...]

The Czech will learn very little about modernized husbandry, little about nature, little about the achievements of scholarship or other things necessary for an educated nation, whereas the German not only prospers because he has so many learned writings but he is also abundantly equipped with all the necessary writings, manuals of some sort for all skills and knowledge. And if the German then belittles the Czech, saying that he is not as good as a German, that he's not fit for various workshops and factories, does he not then perhaps deserve a rap on the knuckles, as in fables the right hand reproaches the left for being a clumsy clot. What a fool! If one exercised both hands equally,

what would prevent the left hand from being on par with the right in everything? [...]

Protiva: All that constitutes evidence that where there is greater respect for skill there tends to be greater respect for industry, efficiency and productivity. But you may be most pleased to know that a nation acquires skills best through a cultivated language. And I think that the Czech, when he grows accustomed to the German language, acquires skills and education sooner and more easily than if he were to get an education in his own language, which has, as the Czechs themselves complain, been neglected for two hundred years; because anyone can grasp that it is easier to understand a hundred books in a foreign language than to write one good book in one's own.

Slavomil: Can anyone doubt that an ability to use languages is good for the country? But if the ability remains in a foreign language, without being disseminated among a great part of the nation, then, I think, it contributes less than the wealth that John Tight rakes in for the rye and saves in an iron chest in his cellar; whereupon, his dear son John Loose, keeping an eye on his father, as soon as he escorts him to the door, runs to lift the lid, and, the wastrel puts the money into free circulation amongst the people. [...] That's my reply to your first objection. Let me now slightly change your second one as follows: It is easier for a nation to produce a hundred good writers than to turn a whole nation into another one. Indeed, give the Czechs what they need for that, and I guarantee that in twenty years you'll see miracles in their literature; whereas those fifty years during which the benefactor of our nation promised that he would completely Germanize Bohemia have long since passed, and it is increasingly clear that he has failed. So may God punish all those Czechs-haters by making them see Bohemia blossom the more abundantly the more they hoped for its demise. [...]

But let us thank God that things are never so bad they couldn't be better. The Czech people does exist. Let the Lords speak French or Chaldean (the more reasonable among them love the language of their people). It doesn't matter that the people believe them to be what they pretend to be, that is, foreigners, and the less they are loved by them the less they love them in return. But it doesn't become them to speak to their subjects through an interpreter, which is really the same as if they were listening with somebody else's ears, eating with somebody else's hands, and needed somebody else's eyes and legs, and let themselves be led as if blind and lame. If blindness and lameness are wretched, what should I say about those comical apes among the lower classes, who think that not knowing Czech makes them upper-class, and consider Czech a peasant language. Poor little things! They don't know

that where it is indigenous every language is a peasant language, and that the peasant is the most important inhabitant of the land, the one who could actually say to them: What's that shrieking round my head? I give you food; if you are human beings as I am, talk so that I can understand you! Is it odd that many persons wish to have their children learn German? But Germans also send their children to Bohemia; both, therefore, feel the need to know both languages. None the less, should the Czech cease being Czech because the German has settled in his country? Why shouldn't the German cease being German instead? [...]

Protiva: From what I can see, contempt for the Czech language ultimately comes only from not knowing it; I now admit the need for the language, and the fact that it has many hidden advantages. I believe you in all those respects, for you are knowledgeable in that area. But I doubt it could ever be raised even to an average level of perfection as long as it is constricted by this vice and prevented by it from developing (and I say this frankly, as our only witness is this silent grove).

Slavomil: Do you mean the constitutional order?

Protiva: Precisely! Because it is clear that the good of the honorable ruling house demands that Czechs should become Germans; that would provide the rulers with ease of administration, unity and strength of government. For, in a word, France is invincible because of its linguistic unity.

Slavomil: I would talk openly, even if the whole world were my witness. Our court treats even enemies justly. Should we be reluctant to speak the truth before it? Deep night would overtake us on these moss-covered roots before I could finish explaining how Czechs always behaved towards each other as non-Czechs; so that, although all the famous rulers from this great house did not act the same towards the Czechs, it can be said that if the Czech language died the Czechs themselves would be to blame. For did they ever unanimously request the rulers of this country to preserve their language, or did they even let it be known that it was dear to them, were they ever denied anything they asked for? Was not the ruler always most indulgent to the wishes of his loyal subjects? The invincibility of France?—I think it has quite different, political, attributes. What is certain is that the dialects of the French tongue, Breton, Cymric and Basque, are quite clearly distinct; and, leaving out the German and other more widespread dialects, is not Celtic still heard among them? After all, multilingual nations have ruled before in the world; and have not monoglots also been slaves? And was our honorable court ever conquered? And if it ever fought with less fortune than its adversaries, was that the fault of the languages of its nations? Was it not

actually stronger for its having led into the field as many different kinds of fighters for honor as it had nations? Is it any wonder they are devoted with all their hearts, for they know that it respects the rights, religions and languages of its nations! Nevertheless, if you think that it needs a unity of languages, which, may I rightfully ask, of those four main languages should be the chief one? I think it should be the Slavonic, simply because four are more than two, and more than one and three-quarters—for that is the approximate ratio of Slavs to Germans to Magyars to Italians in the Monarchy.

Protiva: But I know that the Slavs are the strongest. Consider, however, that they represent many different nations; because the Czech, Slovak, Moravian and even the Pole, Serb and Croat are not the same.

Slavomil: But they are all Slavs who differ from each other only in dialect, although perhaps not more than the Tachov and Kamenice³ Germans in this country differ. But anyway, they would all soon be united by literature and politics. I, for one, have little difficulty imagining a mediating dialect that could unite the fraternal Slavs; it would have to be like High German among the German dialects or like the dialect of poetry or at least that of Plutarch among the Greek dialects.

Translated by Derek Paton and Robert B. Pynsent

³ *Ger.* Tachau, Böhmisch Kamnitz.

VUK STEFANOVIĆ KARADŽIĆ: LITTLE SLAVO-SERBIAN SONG BOOK OF THE COMMON PEOPLE

Title: *Mala prostonarodna slaveno-serbska pjesnarica* (Little Slavo-Serbian song book of the common people)

Originally published: Vienna, Johan Schnirer, 1814

Language: 'Slavo-Serbian,' an artificial literary language of the eighteenth century, resulting from the fusion of Church Slavonic and the vernacular spoken by Serbian merchants in Vojvodina and in the Ottoman Empire

The excerpts used are from the modern edition: *Sabrana dela Vuka Karadžića*, vol. I (Belgrade: Prosveta, 1965), pp. 40–44.

About the author

Vuk Stefanović Karadžić [1787, Tršić (Western Serbia) – 1864, Vienna]: linguist and language reformer. He was born into a peasant family. Karadžić learnt the first elements of reading and writing from his cousin, Jefta Savić, a merchant from Tršić and the only literate person in his village. He spent some time in the neighboring Tronoša monastery, but his family discontinued his monastic education and he was forced to continue learning on his own. He took part in the First Serbian Uprising (1804–1813), serving as a scribe in the staff of the military commander **Karađorđe**. After the failure of the Uprising he fled to Vienna where he met the prominent Slovenian intellectual Jernej Kopitar (1780–1844), one of the founders of Slavic philology and an erudite mediator between the German romantic *Volkskunde* and the Slav cultural revivalists. Under Kopitar's inspiration and guidance, Karadžić started collecting folk songs and began to develop ideas about the relations between nationality and culture. While in Vienna, he published a Serbian grammar (1814) and dictionary (1818), which laid the groundwork for the eventual codification of a unified Serbo-Croatian literary language. Within the same period, in 1814 and 1815, he published two collections of (oral) folk songs, which caused a sensation in European intellectual circles and were translated into several languages. After failing to establish good relations with prince Miloš Obrenović, the first ruler of the autonomous Serbian Principality (r. 1817–1839, 1858–1860), who banned the publication of Karadžić's writings in Serbia in the 1820s, Karadžić went to Germany. There he introduced South-Slavic folk songs to Johann Wolfgang Goethe and Jakob Grimm and collaborated with the German historian Leopold von Ranke on his *Die Serbische Revolution*, by means of which the European public became acquainted with Serbian history. He was the first to introduce a number of Slavic languages to comparative

linguistics, and his folklorist oeuvre spurred similar collecting work by early Bulgarian ethnologists like **Dimitar Marinov** and **Stefan Verkovich**. Vuk Karadžić died in Vienna in 1864. In 1897 his remains were transferred to Belgrade, where he was reburied next to **Dositej Obradović**.

Main works: *Pismenica Serbskago jezika, po govoru prostoga naroda napisana* [Serbian grammar, written according to the speech of the common people] (1814); *Mala prostonarodna slaveno-serbska pjesnarica* [Little Slavo-Serbian song book of the common people] (1814); *Srpski rječnik* [Serbian vocabulary] (1818, 1852); *Novi Zavet* [Translation of the New Testament] (1847); *Život i običaji naroda srpskog* [Life and customs of the Serbian people] (left unfinished and published after his death).

Context

The ‘Little Slavo-Serbian song book’ is the first collection of folk poems published by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić; it accompanied his linguistic reforms, which aimed at turning the vernacular into a literary language—simplifying its orthography and giving it a phonetic character (with one sound corresponding to each character). In the socio-political realm, his work significantly contributed to the forming of the Serbian national project and, albeit non-programmatically, to the Yugoslav one (Karadžić based his reform of the literary standard on a dialect spoken in Herzegovina called Štokavian, which was understood by most Serbs and Croats). The publication of this book represents the first step in a long-lasting struggle that Karadžić conducted in order to affirm the place of Serbian folk culture within the nineteenth-century European process of the ‘discovery of nations.’ From 1834 to 1841 he traveled around various South Slavic lands—Croatia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Montenegro—collecting poems, recording beliefs and traditions and documenting popular customs. He returned periodically to Serbia, but due to constant disagreements with the absolutist Prince Miloš Obrenović he never settled there.

The search for folk poetry and customs and their later codification into national culture was initially set in motion by Karadžić’s attempt to confirm the value and richness of the vernacular language against the dominant “artificial” Slavo-Serbian (*slavenoserbski*) idiom cultivated by the church and the merchants. In Karadžić’s times, when Serbia was fighting for emancipation from the Ottoman Empire, verses that evoked the Serbian national heritage, especially its historical and legendary heroes, represented a literal foundation for defining linguistic/cultural and later also political boundaries. In this sense, while his work was rooted in the Slavic philological school of Kopitar,

Karadžić moved beyond Kopitar's Enlightenment project of Slavic cultural emancipation intertwined with supra-national patriotism. Instead, he turned to the use of the ethnographical references to devise and legitimize a political entity based on ethno-cultural markers.

As the boundaries of the new, autonomous Serbian state were not co-terminous with an 'ethnographic' vision of Serbian territory, a more encompassing imaginary framework of Serbianness was established in literature, by codifying national life, customs and poetry. The introduction to the book explicitly draws the connection between the folk culture, represented by language, customs, customary law, national heroes and sacred places (monasteries), and the political process of nation-building. The latter was largely based on discovering and codifying the 'spirit of the nation' that Karadžić called, influenced by his German-oriented education and inspiration, "Nationalism" (Национализмус). Karadžić's work became influential in the broader European context as well: the 'Song book' features as one of the most important texts in the 'discovery of the nation' in Europe between 1760 and 1848. It inspired a huge number of translations (into English by John Bowring, into Swedish by Johan Runeberg, and into Russian by Alexander Pushkin), and catalyzed a European fashion of Serbian epic poetry, to be emulated by other cultural elites launching their own projects of nation-building. By virtue of this major contribution he was widely recognized as the key figure of the Serbian romantic tradition, exerting also an enormous impact on the European romantic discovery of the poetic force of archaic folk culture.

IE

Preface

[...] Now, if someone were to ask me: "Well, where are the Serbs mostly located nowadays? Which Serbs have kept most of their patriotism? And where is the purest Serbian spoken?"—I would reply as follows:

The core of the Serbian people and the purest speech can nowadays be found between the rivers Drina and Morava; particularly when one gets a little further away from the rivers Sava and Danube, for instance, in the regions of Kragujevac, Karanovac, Rudnik, Užice, Kruševac and above Novi Pazar, across Herzegovina proper. As soon as one crosses the River Drina, from Mačva into Bosnia, many people, having received Turkish law, have merged more with the Turks and use more Turkish words. The same situation exists on the other side of the River Morava, when one passes Resava. In the

region of Požarevac, towards Timok, people have become mixed with the Vlachs. But in the above-mentioned places and in Resava, Serbian folk are still like the Serbs of old, and our beautiful old Serbian names can still be heard among them. [...]

Such and similar thoughts and considerations gave me the incentive to bring to light this Song Book of the common people. There is not a single song included here the soul of which was invented, enriched by reading books, or created according to the rules of versification. These are all the properties of him, whose heart sang them in his simplicity and innocence without any embellishing and according to nature. Although I am not a singer, I learned these songs when, before twelve years—in the luckiest way of being among mortals—I lived tending sheep and goat.

[...] So if I was able to hear so many songs in my place of birth (the village of Tršić in Jadar) and memorize them without any conscious effort, anyone who would apply himself, of course, could collect a huge bookful, just like some Russian poets. I publish these songs; others will perhaps make an effort and collect similar ones in Srem, others still in Bačka, then in Banat, in Slavonia, in Croatia, in Dalmatia, and if Fate allows, in Serbia, Bosnia, Herzegovina and Montenegro as well. Then someone will come along, someone whom God has blessed with the gift of song-writing, who will perchance be able to understand its rules in Latin or German. He will then gather all those collections and review them, adding some songs of his own written according to his taste and the customs of his kin. Thus he will gather all those small collections into one large piece.

I hope that my small collection of songs will be pleasing to each Serb who nurtures patriotic feelings [nacionalizmus] towards his people, and if there happens to be one who will curse me, so be it, it would not come as a surprise to me. It is comfort enough to me that I am publishing this with good intentions and out of a passionate love for the Serbian people and that there will be Serbs who, recognizing this, will approve.

Criticism, from which nothing in this world escapes, will undoubtedly not pass over this song collection of mine either. As far as the songs are concerned, some ignorant Serb woman or a woman from Sarajevo might criticize me for them; but I hope that they too will forgive me if they find something which was, in their opinion, altered or omitted, for I, as I have already said, am no singer. Furthermore, having in mind how long I have been listening to these songs, I could easily have forgotten my own name. As regards language and orthography, anyone can criticize me as much as they like: I wrote the songs down the way I heard them sung, and besides I could not

decide whom to believe, for not only are there no two who would agree or write songs down in the same way, but also no one person writes things down consistently, but one way today and another way tomorrow. And this is how it will always be until our learned men (especially those whose duty requires it) reach an agreement, and together compile a Serbian Grammar Book and a Dictionary. And then shame upon those who cannot or will not abide by those. Until such time each person shall write as well as he knows how, as he wishes, and that is how everybody shall criticize him; for neither the one nor the other has any other rules and thus both could be right, for each man thinks that the best and correct way to do anything is the one he believes to be such.

Here, apart from tender songs and songs of love, which are sung in a female voice, we have some, particularly at the end, which are sung in a well-known Serbian masculine voice accompanied by the gusle and which contain depictions of certain events. I could have added more such songs here, but I fear this might be too much as it is, and that some fashionable Serb would say “What has come over this man to publish such stupid songs?” And I think these songs preserved and still preserve in the common people the Serbian past and name.—

Translated by Krištof Bodri

FERENC KÖLCSEY: NATIONAL TRADITIONS, HYMN

Title: *Nemzeti hagyományok* (National traditions); *Hymnus* (Hymn)

Originally published: The *Hymnus* was written in 1823, and published in 1829 in the magazine *Aurora*; *Nemzeti hagyományok* first appeared in the magazine *Élet és Literatúra*, in 1826

Language: Hungarian

The newest critical edition of the *Hymnus* is Ferenc Kölcsey, *Versek és versfordítások*, ed. by Zoltán G. Szabó (Budapest: Universitas, 2000), pp. 103–105. The most modern edition of *Nemzeti hagyományok* is Ferenc Kulin, ed., *Nemzet és sokaság. Kölcsey Ferenc válogatott tanulmányai* (Budapest: Múzsák, 1988), pp. 35–66; the excerpts are from pp. 50–52, 57, 60–62, 65.

About the author

Ferenc Kölcsey [1790, Sződemeter (*Rom. Săuca*; in Transylvania, present-day Romania) – 1838, Cseke (north-east Hungary)]: poet, literary critic, and editor. He was the offspring of a Calvinist gentry family. In 1796 he entered the Reformed College of Debrecen. He had broad cultural horizons and was well-versed in Greek, Latin, French, and German. In 1809 he completed his law studies in Debrecen. In 1812 he settled on his family estate to practice farming. From the mid-1810s, he began to participate in the cultural debates of the day. Most importantly, in collaboration with Pál Szemere (1785–1861), he joined the controversy over the use of neologisms in the Hungarian language, defending the main ideologist of the modernists, Ferenc Kazinczy, against the traditionalist camp. Beginning in 1826, Kölcsey and Szemere edited the leading cultural periodical, *Élet és Literatúra* (Life and Literature). Between 1833–1835 he acquired a reputation as an outstanding orator in the Hungarian Diet and was an important figure in the liberal opposition, one of his causes being to alleviate the situation of the serfs. However, after the conservative backlash prompted his electors to withdraw their support from his liberal program, he resigned from Parliament. At the end of his life he acted as advocate in the treason trial against **Miklós Wesselényi**. Kölcsey's poetry fused classic references with a new sensitivity to folk culture, while his prose writings and parliamentary speeches, influenced by Cicero and Plutarch, sought to turn the rhetoric of patriotism to support radical social and political reforms. He is considered one of the most influential cultural figures of the Reform Age, and a pioneer in Hungarian literary criticism.

Main works: *Felelet a mondalatra néhai Bohógyi (Somogyi) Gedeon úrnak* [Answer to the pamphlet “Mondolat” to the late Mr. Gedeon Bohógyi (Somogyi)] (with Pál Szemere, 1815); *A szatmári adózó nép állapotáról* [On the state of the tax-paying population of Szatmár county] (1830); *Országgyűlési napló* [Parliamentary diary] (1832–33, published only in 1848); *Munkái* [Works] Vol. I, *Versek* [Poems] (Edited by Pál Szemere, only this volume was published, 1832); *Parainesis* (1837).

Context

After the boom of the 1780–90s, the first fifteen years of the nineteenth century were characterized by cultural inertia due to the unfavorable political conditions in the Habsburg Empire. The reactivation of the Hungarian national movement became noticeable in the mid-1810s, when the project of creating a ‘national literature’ received new inspiration from romantic aesthetic ideas, though it also integrated a plethora of elements from the Enlightenment and the classicist literary tradition. The transformation of Kölcsey’s poetic style and aesthetic views document the complex transition from Classicism to Romanticism. In his ‘Letters from Lasztóc’ (1817), in which he drew on the romantic reinterpretation of Greek culture, especially that of Friedrich Schlegel, he formulated a program of poetic originality linking the problem of the organicity of culture with the process of creation.

The most important issue of the ‘revivalist’ movement was the construction of a framework of cultural institutions and the creation of a ‘national canon.’ In the romantic vision mediated by such works as Joseph Görres’ *Mythengeschichte der Asiatischen Welt*, Friedrich Schlegel’s *Geschichte der alten und neuen Literatur* and the writings of Jakob Grimm, every nation was encouraged to recover its mythical pre-history in order to develop its own peculiar (“eigentümlich”) literature and national culture. In the programmatic ‘National traditions,’ Kölcsey set out to identify the ‘usable’ elements from the Hungarian collective cultural memory and ‘national’ history which might possibly be turned to use for building such a canon. Writers seeking to shape the national discourse had to face the fact that Hungarians evidently had no epic traditions comparable to Homer, the recently ‘discovered’ Ossian, or even the South-Slav epic poems which attracted attention from the 1790s onwards. The lack of ancient poetry prompted poets like Mihály Vörösmarty (1800–1855) to write literary epics on subjects of Hungarian prehistory, while others went so far as to try to counterfeit such an epic tradition, with limited success.

Kölcsey's response to this challenge was to propose identifying a literary 'canon' that should serve to educate the 'national public.' Drawing on Herderian inspiration, his 'National traditions' reiterated the organic theory of national development, comparing ancient peoples to children and the more civilized ones to adult persons. The young nations are more open to irrational inspirations, and this 'animistic' mindset, deeply affected by every extraordinary event, produces national mythologies. Successful national cultures, like classical Greek, evolved organically from these archaic roots, assimilating the foreign influences step by step, so that they could retain the essence of their own tradition. Gradually they became more rational, and their reaching towards a mythical past became a conscious self-reflection. Other cultures, however, like that of ancient Rome, assimilated an excess of sophisticated foreign influences and never managed to establish their own autonomous cultural tradition.

Measured by this vision of organic development, Hungarian culture suffered from serious inadequacies because the public memory has almost completely erased references to the heroic age. This does not mean that of past glories were completely missing, as there are indirect proofs of the ancient virtue of Hungarians, but the historical hurricanes sweeping the country in the past thousand years and the fateful rejection of the pre-Christian cultural heritage in the Middle Ages erased their memory. In order to create a replacement for a national mythology, Kölcsey revisited the Hungarian literary tradition, inquiring whether it could serve as a symbolic framework for the envisaged national awakening. He pays special attention to folksongs, though he also notes the erosion of historical memory contained in them. In the last section of the essay, he turns to Hungarian literature from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century, deploring the inorganic dominance of Latin over the vernacular, and finishes with a plea for a yet to be written dramatic work which would fulfill the role of a 'truly national' creation. In sum, by elaborating a new vision of the national functions of art, 'National traditions' was probably the most important romantic statement of cultural nation-building in Hungary, and in many ways it shaped ensuing discussions of the 'national character.'

Kölcsey's cultural-political discourse is one of the most important examples of the revived 'classical republicanism' that served as a master-narrative for the Hungarian reform movement. The 'Hymn' was also meant to be a patriotic invective, fusing the myth of 'elect nationhood' with the secular project of nation-building. Kölcsey evokes Hungarian history in a parable, contrasting the heroic past to the corrupted present. The discourse of 'elect na-

tionhood' had a strong impact in the sixteenth century, when especially the Protestant preachers depicted the vicissitudes of national history in terms of the alternation of divine grace and punishment, symbolically identifying the nation with the Jews of the Old Testament. The Reform Age often turned for inspiration to the 'national' discourse of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; Kölcsey, in the 'National traditions' also refers to the poetry of Bálint Balassi (1554–1594) and Miklós Zrínyi (*Cro. Nikola Zrinski*; 1620–1664) as the most important precursors of national literature, and especially the poet-politician Zrínyi, author of a Baroque epic with patriotic overtones, became a stock reference in romantic poetry. Textually, there are a number of close similarities between the 'Hymn' and the psalm-translations by the Calvinist Albert Molnár Szenczi (1574–1634), as well as a number of other Protestant writers, for example, the Lutheran pamphleteer István Magyari (?–1605). Nevertheless, in the 'Hymn' this discourse, although originating in the Protestant cultural background of its author, loses its denominational references and becomes a master-narrative for the entire Hungarian nation. Significantly, the adjective 'Hungarian' is used in a vocative case, referring to all members of the nation without social or legal differences.

The poem is central to the Hungarian literary canon. In the 1830s the Hungarian cultural movement called for the creation of a national anthem which could stand beside the Austrian 'Gotterhalte.' Following a public competition in 1844 the tune by the prominent composer Ferenc Erkel was chosen, and it soon became widely popular. Although its legal status as the 'official' anthem was only secured in 1989 (a Parliamentary move for securing this status failed in 1903), it has been considered the anthem of the country ever since the 1840s.

BT

National traditions

Behold! Our scholars can trace the Greek tradition from Chaos and Chronos through Prometheus and Hercules and through all the times right down to the historic centuries, while our own national tradition is founded on such minute fragments scattered so remotely from each other. Yet the national tradition is in many respects an invaluable treasure. Not only because it offers, if not memories, at least traces for the science of historiography; but much more because it is a lodestar of national enthusiasm and, thus, of patriotism. The Roman state constitution, patriotism and the greatness springing

from them had all been built upon myths and cherished by myths; and even those who were lucky enough to be contemporaries of a Scipio, an Aemilius or other great men, looked with emotions glowing with reverence back from a present rich in deeds to the hallowed images of the past; for the present stands in an all too clear, all too human light, whereas the days of yore may appear fabulous, yet its phenomena radiate a slightly superhuman light.

What can have been the cause of the impairment of the traditions of a nation such as ours beyond Álmos?¹ Nations boasting of their long past tend to reach back right to the creation of the world with their traditions, and they recount their stories, albeit in a fabulous form, from the times of their origin. Should we then conclude that a nation that is unable to do so is a quite recent branch of some more ancient tribe from which it separated, so slight in number as to be unworthy of attention, and then, growing ignorant, came to remember nothing about its separation? Or that a nation without tradition has wasted away its time in a spiritless fashion, without any great feats, and thus had no memories to pass on to its descendants? But the language of the Hungarians proves their originality, and its kinship to several extinct languages shows its antiquity; and the fact that Álmos and his son Árpád traced their descent from beyond the Carpathians, and led a nation dazzling in its fear-inspiring greatness and its youth full of vigor, leaves no doubt that this nation must have been trained for such a bloody destiny by long periods of struggle.

Can it be that the nation had no regard for its own deeds? But we read that bards sang at Attila's table; and Anonymus² mentions the songs of the common folk praising ancient feats. Should there not have existed in subsequent ages what had existed during the reign of Attila, in the times of Árpád's descendants and even under King Matthias?³ Surely, it was thanks to the passage of time and to state-ravaging tempests that the traces of the heroic age sank into oblivion; and perhaps thanks, too, to their descendants' deplorable indifference toward the memories of antiquity, the nation and patriotism.

¹ Álmos (819–895), tribal chief of the Hungarians at the time the Hungarians appeared in the Carpathian Basin, and father of Árpád.

² "Magister P.," traditionally referred to as Anonymus, author of the *Gesta Hungarorum* (c. 1200), which was the first surviving chronicle describing the origins of the Hungarians.

³ Matthias Corvinus, son of János Hunyadi, king of Hungary (1458–1490), distinguished for his Renaissance cultural orientation and bold foreign policy, which defied the Ottomans and the Holy Roman Empire as well. His rule is traditionally considered as the most splendid period of the history of late-medieval Hungary. He also supported the creation of a new humanist narrative of the Hungarian past which reworked the historical lore of the medieval chronicles.

I would not venture to declare whether the same had been true centuries ago, but we certainly have no excuse now for the derelictions committed for such a long time. [...]

Tradition gains a more poetic form when it is divided into more and more stories: such stories that, bearing novelistic characteristics, may lend an animating lustre to the whole. Greek tradition is full of such stories, and these have all the more poetic loftiness in that they have either been turned into myths or have intermingled with myths. In the Hungarian tradition we can discern no mythological traces at all; and after the adoption of Christianity these would have been seen as alien anyway. [...]

Christianity, politics and science have brought our Hungarians closer to their European neighbors in diverse ways; on the other hand, their own state constitution, language, customs and mutual animosities have held them back in diverse ways. It is thus that they have adapted many European features, while at the same time they preserved many non-European ones. But the latter were much more conspicuous only fifty years ago than they are now; and the more they incline towards decay, the more painfully conscious we become of the absence of a writer who could have portrayed our ancestors in their simple and original greatness. Such a writer should have been born either in the ancient days of the heroic age or on its margins. In the later years of sophistication the ancient is represented with features of the present age; thus we see Trojan heroes depicted in Virgil's lines, which shine with a thousand beauties, but they are animated by the spirit of Octavian's times; whereas with the figures in Homer and Ossian the external form, the soul and the spirit of the age all converge. [...]

I fancy that the original sparks of a real national poetry are to be sought in the songs of the common folk; therefore it is expedient to look to our peasant songs with this in mind. We find two kinds of them; for they either relate stories or sing about the personal emotions of the moment. In neither group can we encounter very ancient pieces, which justifies my remark above about the lack of feeling of the Hungarians towards their ancient past. Who would dare to deny that the days of yore possessed songs of a more honorable character than the present times?

[...] Among the songs of the second kind more sparks of poetry seem to glitter. In some of them we encounter, even if only for a few lines, genuine sentiments, a certain light and carefree flight and an attractive alternation from one subject to the other; but it is also undeniable that their most vulgar characteristic is the empty and inappropriate fabrication of rhymes, which causes the most incongruous ideas to be strung together and to form

a ridiculous disarray, in which better-matched ideas are occasionally intermingled.

Are we to believe that, the national poetry having been elevated long ago, it will no longer be found among peasants but among the more refined classes of the nation instead? Let us step back a little and try to find the way by which our poetry, making a shift into the written language, could have become more refined. [...] Let us confess that we have chosen the wrong path in learning from the Romans. Instead of ascending within our circles with their assistance, we have inclined to servile imitation; instead of absorbing their spirit and making it our own within our own world, we transformed ourselves to their world; but not feeling at home there, we keep glancing back to our homeland, and, our imagination permanently divided, we remain strangers both here and there. Isn't it obvious that a real national poetry can and must soar only from the bosom of the nation? The light from an alien fire can only dimly shine for a nation.

[...] And yet beyond all doubt the straightest path lies open through the writing of theatrical works. Of all the genres of poetry this is the one with the most direct and most palpable relation to the sphere of everyday life. Epic and lyric poetry both conjure a world in front of our eyes, yet this world appears with the poet, and floats in a certain distance, in a certain height above us. In a drama the poet must make himself visible: a refined life flows on beside and around us, and our illusion assuming the features of reality, we seem to rise out of ourselves and we are imperceptibly blended into the poetic world. Happy is the poet who can allure us to such pleasant illusions, and from whose world no cold interests, unpleasant conflicts or feelings of strangeness can thrust our fancy back! In his works a real poetic realm would be created in which a refined nation would find its homeland; in his works the glorious heroic past and the present, the sentiments of humanity and patriotism could all embrace; while we, constantly held in check by remembrance and compulsion, would be saved from the peril posed by an incessant progress pressing further and further forward—the peril of gradually losing our original features and our bosoms becoming unable to take fire any more.

But when shall such a poet emerge, and when shall the arms of a fair-minded nation and a suitable national theatre ever open for such a poet?!

Translated by Dávid Oláh

Hymn

Bless the Magyar, Lord we pray,
Nor in bounty fail him,
Shield him in the bloody fray
When his foes assail him.
He whom ill-luck long has cursed,
This year grant him pleasure,
He has suffered with the worst
Time beyond all measure.

To Carpathian peaks you brought
Bendeguz's nation,⁴
Beautiful the land you wrought
For their occupation.
Wherever the Danube rolls
Where the Tisza urges
Heroic seed of Árpád's soul
Flowers along their verges.

Ears of ripe corn wave to us
Across Cumanian meadows,
Tokay grapes extend to us
Honey dripping shadows.
Flags of ours you plant upon
Turkey's forts and fences,
Matthias's horde tramples down
Wien's proud defences.

Ah, but through our crimes and faults
Furiously driven,
You unleashed your thunderbolts
Hurling them from heaven,
Arrows of the Mongol hordes
Rained on us in battle,
Then the Turkish overlords
Took us for their chattel.

⁴ Prince of the Huns, father of Attila.

Osman lips, how frequently,
With their fearsome crowing,
Celebrated victory
As our blood was flowing.
Dearest land, sons of your clay
Turned on their own mother,
You, their charnel house, where they
Laid waste to each other.

Fugitive, concealed, alone,
Fearing sword and sentry,
Vainly seeking for a home
In his native country,
Climbs the peak, flees to the vale,
Doubt and care uphold him,
Seas of blood lap at his heel,
Seas of fire enfold him.

Castle once, now heap of stones;
Fled are all its graces,
Death-cries, rattles, sighs and groans
Occupy their places.
Ah but liberty disdains
Veins that death must vanquish,
Red-eyed orphans in their chains
Weeping where they languish.

With the Magyar take your stand,
Lord, in his vain struggles,
Shield him with your mighty hand
From that sea of troubles.
He whom ill-luck long has cursed
This year grant him pleasure,
He has suffered with the worst
Time beyond all measure!

**Translated by George Szirtes, in *The Lost Rider: A Bilingual Anthology*
(Budapest: Corvina, 1997), pp. 71–73.**

MAURYCY MOCHNACKI: THOUGHTS ON HOW THE TRANSLATION OF FOREIGN BELLES-LETTRES INFLUENCES POLISH LITERATURE

Title: *Kilka myśli o wpływie tłumaczeń z obcych języków na literaturę polską z dołączeniem wiersza 'Emroda' Kropińskiego, przełożonego na język francuski przez Polkę, księżnę C...* (Thoughts on how translation of foreign belles-lettres influences Polish literature with a poem from 'Emrod' by Kropiński, translated into French by the Polish countess C...)

Originally published: *Dziennik Warszawski*, 1825, no. 3, vol. 1, pp. 449–456 (anonymously)

Language: Polish

Modern Polish edition: Maurycy Mochnacki, *Pisma krytyczne i polityczne*, vol. 1, ed. by Zbigniew Przychodniak, Jacek Kubiak and Elżbieta Nowicka (Cracow: Universitas, 1996), pp. 87–90.

About the author

Maurycy Mochnacki [1803, Bojaniec near Żółkiew (present-day Boyanets and Zhovkva, in Ukraine) – 1834, Auxerre (France)]: literary critic and radical political leader. Son of a lawyer, he studied at Warsaw University and was expelled in 1822 after having offended a police inspector. He became involved in intellectual circles influenced by German literature (Goethe, Schiller) and philosophy (Kant, Fichte, Schelling). Concurrently, Mochnacki participated in a conspiracy against Russian dominance in the Kingdom. He was arrested in 1823 and released after eight months of imprisonment in return for publishing a memorandum on the dangers of liberalism in the educational system of the 'Congress Kingdom' (which was intended to be used for the justification of planned restrictions). That act shaped his popular image as a dubious and mendacious (though very intelligent) adventurer. In the mid-1820s, Mochnacki emerged as one of the most influential and innovative literary and musical critics, developing his own critical terminology. He participated in the debates between romantics and classicists. In his *O literaturze polskiej w wieku dziewiętnastym* (On Polish literature in the nineteenth century), published in 1830, he was among the first to formulate the theory of Polish literary Romanticism. In the days of the November Uprising (1830–31), Mochnacki advocated a radical democratic position. He published several articles on the political situation of Poland stressing the need for widening the social basis of the uprising. Then he volunteered to serve in the Polish army. After the collapse of the insurrection, he moved to France and joined Polish radical organizations. Disappointed by the internal quarrels among the

Polish democrats, he eventually joined the conservative 'Hôtel Lambert'—the organization of Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski. Unlike other literary figures of the time such as **Adam Mickiewicz**, Juliusz Słowacki, and Zygmunt Krasiński, Mochnacki never became a national 'prophet.' Even though the figure of Mochnacki does not linger in the Polish collective memory, this talented theoretician is highly praised by historians of Polish literature.

Main works: *O literaturze polskiej w wieku dziewiętnastym* [On Polish literature in the nineteenth century] (1830); *O duchu i źródłach poezji w Polsce* [The spirit and sources of Polish poetry] (1825); *Powstanie narodu polskiego w r. 1830 i 1831* [Insurrection of the Polish Nation in 1830 and 1831] (1833–1834).

Context

In the years following the debut of **Adam Mickiewicz's** *Ballady i romanse* (in the volume *Poezje*, 1822), one part of the Polish cultural elite felt offended by the new literary style for its neglect of classical meter and for composing unconventional plots. But at the same time, groups of younger scholars and students at the universities in Warsaw, Cracow and Wilno (*Lit.* Vilnius) turned away from literary classicism and the moderate political stance of the previous generation. The controversies were often summarized in a simplified formula: enlightened reason vs. romantic sentiment, to be accompanied soon by another conflict: loyalty vs. revolution.

In the late 1820s the adherents of literary Romanticism also shared the vision of a 'national revolution' against the tsar. Mochnacki was one of the most creative theoreticians of the new literary and political generation that sought to replace the political elite which created the '3rd of May Constitution,' the Warsaw Duchy and the 'Congress Kingdom.' Transcending the borders of literary theory, he formulated a set of ideas concerning the 'identity' of the Polish nation. His definition of the nation de-emphasized the empirical in favor of the spiritual and moral. Mochnacki presented the final formulation of the idea of the Polish nation in his book, 'On Polish literature in the nineteenth century,' where he connected 'the national essence' with such features as common language and culture, and even climate. These features, however, did not describe the nation completely; they only formed an environment in which the real, spiritual national idea was formed.

Mochnacki in his writings searched for descriptive features to define the symbolic borderlines of Polishness. In the present article, Mochnacki raises the problem of translations from foreign languages and the necessity of original literary production. Whereas thinkers of the Polish Enlightenment intended to (and did) 'import' ideologies and organizational achievements

from the West, Mochnacki stressed the role of autochthonous 'national literature' as an expression of the nation's peculiar character. At the same time, he raised the problem of exporting Polish intellectual achievements to the West. He was thus answering the same sort of questions as those raised by **Staszic** or **Jezierski**. While these theoreticians shaped by the Enlightenment put the rule of universal progress above national peculiarities, Mochnacki and other thinkers of the nineteenth century looked for the absolute within the sphere of the national. This search culminated in the specific philosophical systems created by Józef Maria Hoene-Wroński, August Cieszkowski and Bronisław Trentowski, which were based on the assumption that the moral priority and martyrdom of Poles gives them a special right to represent the values of humanity and progress and the salvation of humankind.

While in the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth century Mochnacki's contribution to the theory of literature was virtually ignored, during the last decades his *oeuvre* has finally become the subject of literary studies. His writings have gained him the reputation of having offered the most important Polish romantic contribution to the theory of literature.

MG

Thoughts on how the translation of foreign belles-lettres influences Polish literature

Montesquieu once said that "a man who does nothing but translation, shall never see his own works translated." This could have well been said by the author of 'The Spirit of Laws,' 'Persian letters,' and many other works, which brought him and his country international recognition and fame. One of our learned countrymen compared translation to attentive reading, in the process of which we gain insight into essential ideas underlying the linguistic coat of written texts. The masters of our country's literature have already recognized the dual role of translation as both enriching and impoverishing their mother tongue. However, the phenomenon of translation deserves attention not only due to its constructive or destructive impact on our native language, but also with regard to its powerful influence, be it inspiring or discouraging, on our intellectual heritage which is an inexhaustible source of forms and ideas. Have the numerous translations of foreign texts into Polish multiplied the intellectual resources of our nation? Have they enriched and intensified the flow of ideas, thoughts and visions which establish to a greater or lesser extent the intellectual level of our culture, and thus become the

measures of its moral value? These are the naturally emerging questions, by answering which we could reach some valuable conclusions. As the process of cultural development is irregular and its course uneven, some nations reach high levels of culture at a rapid pace, while others achieve it slowly and gradually. Our nation used to exceed its neighbors in this process, but today they have outdistanced us in educational development, gained recognition for their scientific discoveries, and thus accelerated their march towards cultural supremacy so significantly that we can no longer expect to finish the race ahead of them. In order to keep up with the others and to counteract the current of civilization, we decided to follow in their steps, collect all the crumbs from their table, appropriate them as our own, and nourish the fruit of foreign labor until they bear new seeds. The French, the English, and the Germans have mastered the exercise of the human mind. We, therefore, feel justified in usurping for ourselves their intellectual achievements in all areas of knowledge, arguing that it is useless to repeat their enterprise and that we can, at a lower cost, by translating their work and using them as a model, gain from these discoveries the same as their authors. However, our profits will be a mere illusion, unless, of course, we devalue the worth of intellectual superiority to the level of a commodity. Just as Peruvian and Bolivian gold did not enrich but rather impoverished Spain, making it negligent of its national industry and indifferent in the face of the declining industriousness so the translations of minor foreign works will not only fail to enrich Polish literature, they will most certainly drive it to ruin. The possibility of effortless intellectual progress offered by translation, an exaggerated stress on learning foreign languages, and the widening gap between our everyday reality and the sphere of intellectual endeavors—all this heralds the dawn of an epoch of our country's intellectual paralysis or even stagnation. A conclusion to be drawn here is that translations are by and large damaging, since they encourage stagnation not only in terms of language but also in terms of the ideas and thoughts this language expresses. This conclusion requires further discussion. If such thinkers as Montaigne, Montesquieu, Kant, Fichte, and many others, instead of exploring their own thoughts and visions—which have proven enriching for science and literature, which have broadened the human mind, the scope of its abilities, and epistemological horizons—had limited themselves to translating and copying lesser works, their achievements would not be so outstanding nor their profession so useful and important. The power of thought is man's grandest valor. Thought multiplies the moral and sensual existence of communities; it is our alternative reality, our second nature and our second life. And it is the mastering of this divine power, the

strengthening of its force, course and inner properties that lays the foundations both for a nation's intellectual prosperity and for the moral refinement of an individual, as well as for the future fate of science and scientific inventions. Therefore, the people who observe the progress of civilization from a privileged position ought to be aware that the profitability of intellectual enterprise depends on the circulation of ideas among all classes of society, and that foreign creations do not enrich these ideas in any way, do not provoke intellectual speculation, and do not by any means make up for the serious deficiencies in the society's intellectual activity. The process of educating individuals and entire societies resembles a journey, which, if financed by third parties and neighbors, may never take place at all. The masterpieces of human intellect created by a foreign hand can be a useful source of knowledge, but if we treat them as our only reference we will never be able to reach our own goals without their assistance.

The growing need for translations in Poland is mainly due to the abundance on our literary scene of pseudo-literati who treat writing as craftsmanship, and the scarce number of original and insightful writers. And undoubtedly, acute observation and high intellectual standards are the guarantees of the happiness of individuals as well as the well-being of entire generations. However, without regard for the necessity of directing our minds towards issues and matters concerning the general state of humanity, we have come to treat the usurpation of foreign treasures as our undeniable right, in claiming which we have proven our incompetence. In this we ought to restrain ourselves. While evaluating the influence of translation on Polish literature, the attention of this nation's great minds should be directed to the fact that the benefits of a translated work, even if the translation is perfect, will always be meager and ambiguous. For, are we not, when satisfying this immediate need to adopt, wasting those powers of ours that could be used for creating correspondingly original creations of our own? Are we not plunging ourselves into inertia or weakening our inborn capacity for thought, which is fruitful and vivid only when it moulds and sculpts the material on its own? The powers of the human mind are like lightning, which can energize the atmosphere only if from time to time it clears it with thunder. For that, however, it needs great objects such as rocks, buildings, and trees. By merely translating Kepler, Galileo and Leibniz we are not going to touch the greatest ideas of humankind, broaden the capacities of the human mind or gain insight into the oldest laws of nature. Thinking is all there is to existence, and therefore we live only as long as we continue to search for the evidence of our existence in the intellect. If this were not the case, there would be no difference between the

life of a human being and that of a plant. And indeed there are examples of individuals and nations that live like the latter.

Nevertheless, there exists also a less destructive kind of translation, which could be used for those Polish literary works that are not known outside the country's borders. Would it not be better if, instead of boastfully declaring how many foreign languages we know, we used this knowledge to translate Polish literature into French, German or English? A few of our countrymen have already undertaken this noble though burdensome project. One of them, Countess C.,¹ driven by precisely this urge to promote our national pride, wanted to popularize the works of our best poets by translating into French the poems of Mickiewicz, the rhymes of Kropi ski² and Krasicki's³ fairytales. Having obtained her permission we publish here the French version of Kropi ski's elegy *Emrod* as an example of a translation which preserves all of the features of the author's poetic diction, versification and stylistic lightness, which is especially difficult to preserve in a foreign language.

Translated by Zuzanna Ładyga

¹ Izabela Czartoryska (1764–1835), wife of Count Adam Kazimierz Czartoryski, translator and collector of national antiquities.

² Ludwik Kropiński (1767–1844), general and poet.

³ Ignacy Krasicki (1735–1801), Catholic bishop and poet.

CHARLES SEALSFIELD: AUSTRIA AS IT IS

Title of text: *Austria as It Is: Or, Sketches of Continental Courts. By an Eye Witness*

Originally published: London, Hurst, Chance, and Co., 1828

Language: English

Excerpts used are from *Austria as It Is: Or, Sketches of Continental Courts. By an Eye Witness* (London: Hurst, Chance, and Co., 1828), pp. v–vi, 51–52, 144, 152, 154–155, 209–210.

About the author

Charles Sealsfield (real name **Karl Magnus Postl**, other pseudonym used C. Sidons) [1793, Poppitz, (Cz. Popice, today Czech Republic) – 1864, Solothurn (Switzerland)]: writer and journalist. He was the first son of a well-to-do Moravian-German farmer and wine-grower. Following his mother's wishes, he entered the service of the church. After finishing the gymnasium at Znaim (Cz. Znojmo), he went to Prague and registered at a college belonging to the Knights of the Cross. In 1813 Sealsfield entered the cloister as a novice, and in 1814 he was ordained a priest. In Prague he became acquainted with the religious teachings of **Bernard Bolzano** (1781–1848), who influenced much of his early thinking. In 1823 Sealsfield went to Vienna and attempted to obtain the position of a private secretary in the service of the government. Having failed to obtain the job and after clashing with the Austrian authorities, he fled to the United States via Switzerland and France. In 1828 Sealsfield began to contribute to *Morgenblatt* (Morning paper), the literary supplement edited by Wolfgang Menzel (1798–1873), the critical forerunner of the '*Junges Deutschland*' (Young Germany) movement. It was Menzel who in *Literaturblatt* (Literary Page) (1838) first recognized the literary qualities of Sealsfield's writings. In 1830 Sealsfield became editor of the *Courrier des États Unis*, a journal which popularized French revolutionary ideas in America. In the 1830s he published anonymously several successful novels. He preserved his anonymity until 1845, when he published the first edition of his 'Collected works' under the name of Charles Sealsfield. Many contemporary critics believed him to be an American—born of German parents. In 1831 he returned to Europe, lived in Paris and London and worked for Joseph Bonaparte (1768–1844), who was at the time in exile in America. From 1832 until the end of his life, Sealsfield lived in Switzerland. While Sealsfield is considered an important representative of German literature of the

'Vormärz' era, he also played an important role in the development of American literature, as he was one of the first authors to deal with the cultural encounter between Anglo-Saxons and Native Americans in his novels.

Main works: *Die Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika, nach ihren politischen, religiösen und gesellschaftlichen Verhältnissen betrachtet* [The United States of America observed from the perspective of its political, religious and social relations] (1827); *Austria as it is: Or, Sketches of Continental Courts* (1828); *Tokeah; or the White Rose* (1828), which was translated into German as *Der Legitime und die Republikaner* (1833); *Der Virey und die Aristokraten oder Mexiko im Jahre 1812* [The Viceroy and the aristocrats, or Mexico in the year 1812] (1835); *Die große Tour* [The Grand Tour] (1835); *Lebensbilder aus beiden Hemisphären* [Pictures from both Hemispheres] (1835–1837); *Neue Land- und Seebilder oder die deutsch-amerikanischen Wahlverwandtschaften* [New land and sea pictures, or German-American elective affinities] (1839–1840); *Das Cajütenbuch, oder Nationale Charakteristiken* [The cabin book or national characteristics] 2 vols., (1841); *Süden und Norden* [South and North] (1842–1843).

Context

Between 1815 and 1848 the political and cultural life of the Austrian Empire was marked by two intertwining phenomena. On the one hand, conservatism and the anti-revolutionary policies devised by Prince Metternich (1773–1859) dominated the political sphere. On the other hand, the style known as 'Biedermeier' (initially the name of a fictional character, invented by the Swabian humorist Ludwig Eichrodt in 1855 to express the pious and composed character of the civic culture in the Austrian Empire before 1848) characterized cultural life. Metternich began his career under Francis II (I), the last emperor of the Holy Roman Empire (1792–1806) and the first emperor of Austria (1804–1835). At the end of the Napoleonic Wars, the emerging new European order was based on two principles: restoration of pre-revolutionary values and a political system which could safeguard the monarchies of Europe from the revolutionary changes brought about by the French Revolution. Metternich's diplomacy proved successful during the Congress of Vienna (September 1814–June 1815) and 'The Holy Alliance' of Austria, Russia and Prussia was created to confine national and liberal movements within Europe. After 1815, Metternich became the symbol of the new political order. It was only the revolution of 1848 that eventually terminated his prominence in Austrian politics.

One of the most important features of the cultural atmosphere of the period was the apolitical inclination of the cultural elite. The literature of the time was thus dominated by a feeling of resignation, based on self-control

and conformity. Although *Biedermeier* literature consisted primarily of poetry, theater also flourished in Vienna, despite strict censorship laws, as illustrated by the plays of Ferdinand Raimund (1790–1836), Johann Nepomuk Nestroy (1801–1862) or **Franz Grillparzer** (1791–1872). In many ways, the predilection for detachment and seclusion in the private sphere as advocated by the *Biedermeier* elite complemented Metternich's intention of creating a submissive public sphere. Nevertheless, the withdrawal from politics did not obstruct cultural activity altogether. Although apolitical in its general outlook, literature served as a modality for expressing criticism of Metternich's political system. Literary works were politicized by resorting to historical and classical allegories, which, in turn, contained disguised political messages. However, the critical and satirical attitude towards the general development of politics in Austria was not revolutionary, since it promoted a pro-Habsburg loyalty, rather than being anti-Metternich.

Sealsfield gave a completely different criticism of both Metternich's political system and the cultural submissiveness favored by the *Biedermeier* style, in his pamphlet *Austria as It Is* (1828). The book was banned in Austria but in 1834 the German edition was published under the title *Seufzer aus Österreich und seinen Provinzen*, which was in fact a translation of the French edition *L'Autriche telle qu'elle est*. Influenced by the American experience and a sympathizer of the French revolutionary ideals, Sealsfield regarded Metternich as a menace to the development of the Austrian Empire and Europe. The influence of the *Junges Deutschland* ('Young Germany') movement is also discernable. Following Heinrich Heine (1797–1856), with whom Sealsfield corresponded, the poets, thinkers and journalists supporting the movement advocated the liberation of politics, religion and manners from old conventional norms. Sealsfield's criticism of Austria under Metternich was based on the same principles. However, he went further than simply describing Metternich's rule as a refined despotism and exhibiting support for the restoration of constitutions to the Hungarians and the Czechs. For Sealsfield the political oppression cultivated by Metternich was supported by the introspection and particularism advocated by *Biedermeier* culture in Austria. Both of them were considered detrimental to the development of cultural and political life. If Metternich's political system was seen as a form of despotism, encroaching on the development of civic consciousness in Austria, the apolitical attitude adhered to by *Biedermeier* authors was viewed as lacking the public activism that writers, as critical voices of society, required. In this sense, one can speak of a conflict between the radical potentials of romanticism and the tamer *Biedermeier* version. All this was colored by Sealsfield's

American experience: his insistence that what Austria needed was a constitution—which should reflect the political demands of her nationalities—was largely derived from his appreciation of American democracy and its constitutional system.

Sealsfield's text was greatly praised by reformist and pro-republican circles in Europe during the nineteenth century. As such, it was regarded as one of the most substantial critiques of the Metternich regime, and seen as one of the texts which prefigured the revolutionary events of 1848.

MT

Austria as It Is: Or, Sketches of Continental Courts

The author of this work is a native of the Austrian Empire; who, after an absence of five years, has re-visited his country, and found its *status quo* as exhibited in the following pages.

In presenting his work to the English public, he may be allowed to state that no person can have a more sincere respect for the just rights of monarchs, as long as they are exercised within proper bounds. But if a limited monarchy, where the three powers, legislative, judicial, and executive, are properly separated and exercised, be the most conducive to social happiness, the despotism of Austria, and those kingdoms and principalities influenced by it, and by the Holy Alliance, is of a nature the more shocking, inasmuch as the intellectual progress of these countries indisputably entitles them to the blessings of a liberal and rational government. Never, perhaps, has there been exhibited an example of so complete and refined a despotism in any civilized country as in Austria. [...]

The character of these peasants is such as one might expect from a people depressed by a crowd of masters, every one of whom thinks himself entitled to make them sensible of their superiority. They are slavish, insidious, treacherous! There is a gloom brooding on the countenance of the Bohemian, or, as he prefers to style himself Czechian, which makes him unfeeling and stubbornly indifferent to your money or your offers; and he rejects every argument except that *ad hominem*. Music is the only thing which clears up his melancholy brow. It is astonishing what a deep sense the Bohemian of the lowest class has of music. The gloomy stare of his countenance brightens; his sharp grey eyes kindle and beam with fire and sensibility; the whole man is changed. Nothing can exceed the dignity and harmony of the sacred music. [...]

Never has there been a man more detested and dreaded than Metternich. From the Baltic to the Pyrenees, from the boundaries of Turkey to the borders of Holland, there is but one voice heard respecting this Minister—that of execration. As he was the chief instrument in new modelling the present form of Europe, the author and the mainspring of the Holy Alliance, that embryo of great events, his character and policy deserve our impartial investigation. [...]

That the Austrian nations desire their constitutions as much as any other people, no person will dispute, from what we see going on in Hungary, Bohemia, Italy, and the Tyrol. But, besides that constitutions are an utter abhorrence to Metternich and his master, these people want their old constitutions. Bohemia wants that granted by Rudolf II.; Hungary would disdain to hear of any other constitution than its own; the Tyrol desires its monarchs to deliver to them their coronation oath, sitting on the Ducal Stone in a field near Innsbruck, just as their counts did in the twelfth century; Venice sighs after its Doge; Milan after its Dukes. To satisfy and to manage, at the same time, so many different bodies and interests, would require more pliability than even Metternich is master of. [...]

We shall forbear long inquiry as to the best course to be pursued with respect to Austria, and willingly allow that this empire and its nations are not yet ripe for a constitution. A constitution, whether extorted by the force of arms from a weak prince, or whether the free gift of a sovereign, will sleep, and not be properly enjoyed by the nation until the materials for its proper use are ready prepared in it: a proportionate division of property and intellectual light. England only made a constant use of its excellent charter, when the feudal power of its barons was broken, property more equally divided, and the nation enlightened. France follows in the same footsteps. Germany has light, but the steps which in Prussia have been taken during the administration of Baron Stein,¹ are again in a retrograde movement. The rest of Germany consists of a collection of vast manors belonging to lords, who are called kings and princes; their subjects are little better than tenants. The Austrian empire presents but immense domains of the nobility, and small parcels of land of the peasantry. There is no connecting link between these two extremes of wealth and information, and of poverty and darkness, in a third middle state. A great statesman, such a one as Chatham, Pitt, Sully, Colbert, or Stein, would have sold the immense domains of the *crown, of the fund of*

¹ Baron Heinrich Friedrich Karl vom und zum Stein (1757–1831): German statesman, proponent of radical reforms in Prussia during the Napoleonic wars.

public worship, of the studies, and of the different corporations to the nation, and thus have created a third order, and the materials for a steady and moral futurity. They would have promoted, at the same time, rational information. The former ministers of France would certainly have pursued a third course, that of a paternal government, an economical retrenchment of the public expenses, re-establishment of order in the finances, strict justice towards the people, a religious adherence to promises and to public faith, and a successive and gradual improvement. They would have proceeded on the road which Francis pursued, and successfully pursued till 1811. This would, perhaps, have been the course most suitable to the present interest of this vast collection of provinces. [...]

A more fettered being than an Austrian author surely never existed. A writer in Austria must not offend against any Government; nor against any minister; nor against any hierarchy, if its members be influential; nor against the aristocracy. He must not be liberal—nor philosophical—nor humorous—in short, he must be nothing at all. Under the catalogue of offences, are comprehended not only satires, and witticisms; – nay, he must not explain things at all, because they might lead to serious thoughts. If he venture to say any thing upon these subjects, it must be done in that devout and reverential tone which befits an Austrian subject, who presumes to lift the veil from these *ticklish secrets!* What would have become of Shakespeare had he been doomed to live or to write in Austria?

DIMITRIOS VYZANTIOS: BABEL, OR THE LOCAL DISTORTION OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE

Title: *Βαβυλωνία ἢ ἡ κατὰ τόπους διαφθορά τῆς ἐλληνικῆς γλώσσας. Κωμωδία*
(Babel, or the local distortion of the Greek language: A comedy)

Originally published: Ναύπλιο (Nafplio), Τυπογραφεῖο Κωνσταντίνου Τόμ-
πρα ἐκ Κυδωνιῶν καὶ Κωνσταντίνου Ἰωαννίδη ἐκ Σμύρνης, 1836

Language: Greek

The excerpt used is from D. C. Vyzantios, *Βαβυλωνία*, introduction by Spyros Evangelatos (Athens: Εστία, 1993), pp.1–3.

About the author

Dimitrios Vyzantios (pseudonym of Dimitrios K. Hatziaslanis) [1790, Constantinople (Istanbul) – 1853, Patras (Peloponnese)]: playwright, icon-painter and state official. He was taught icon painting at an early age by a monk. His career as a bureaucrat started in 1812 when he was appointed as a translator for the Bey of Tunis. This indicates that he could speak and write at least Ottoman Turkish and French. In 1821 he joined the Greek uprising and was appointed to several administrative positions. At the end of 1821 he was appointed as deputy secretary of the Senate of the Peloponnese. Later on, during Ibrahim's invasion of the Morea (Peloponnese), he served in several places as governor. In 1826 he served as first secretary of the penal court and later on secretary general of the Ministry of War. After King Otto's arrival, he became frustrated with the Regency's policies and withdrew to Patras, where he worked as an icon-painter, notably in the famous church of St. Andreas. The *literati* of his time, Phanariots educated in Constantinople or 'Diaspora Greeks' educated in the West, offered the services of their pen or sword to several political patrons. However, most of them ended up as purists who would occupy themselves by writing treatises in order to point at what, in their view, was wrong. Vyzantios, on the contrary, chose to educate his contemporaries while at the same time amusing them. He achieved fame with *Babel* and the rest of his theatrical production.

Main works: *Βαβυλωνία* [Babel] (1836); *Συνασίς* [Sinasis] (1838); *Γυναικοκρατία* [Female domination] (1841); *Κόλαξ* [Flatterer] (1858).

Context

Between 1824 and 1825, the Greek War of Independence went through a crisis due to civil wars between the temporary revolutionary government and prominent military leaders. Moreover, Sultan Mahmud II, after the Janissaries' failure to suppress the uprising, called on the assistance of Muhammad Ali, the semi-independent governor of Egypt. Muhammad Ali sent his son Ibrahim with a fleet to the Morea. In a short period of time, Ibrahim managed to eliminate almost all resistance and came very close to a final suppression of the uprising. However, the Great Powers considered that such a development would not serve their interests. Already at the beginning of the uprising, the news of the massacres in Chios and the heroic achievements of the Greek warriors had generated a significant wave of philhellenism throughout Europe. Eugène Delacroix, for instance, depicted the Chios massacres in one of his famous paintings. Lord Byron, the most well-known figure among the philhellenes, not only composed hymns for the Greek uprising; he also lost his life in the town of Messolongi in 1824 (see **Dionysios Solomos**, *Hymn to liberty*). In this way, the mobilization of European intellectuals instigated an increasing movement of romantic volunteers who rushed to fight on the side of the revolted Greeks. The support that the Greek uprising enjoyed among European nations eventually had an impact on the policies of their governments. After the first shock the Greek uprising had on the conservative 'European concert,' certain politicians had gradually become more favorable towards the Greek cause. Finally, the Great Powers came to an agreement, known as the London Pact (1826), which eventually led to the battle at Navarino, where the Egyptian-Ottoman fleet was destroyed. This battle marked the definitive shift of European official policy towards the Greek uprising.

The plot of 'Babel' takes place within these historical circumstances, during the first days after the battle of Navarino. Greek-Orthodox guests from different areas of the Ottoman Empire (Anatolia, the Morea, Chios, Crete, Albania and Cyprus), together with a gendarme officer from the Ionian Islands who shows up after a fight has broken out between a Cretan and an Albanian, rush to Nafplio—the temporary capital of the revolutionary government—to celebrate the victory. The psychological features of this 'historical' moment are depicted in these characters: anxiety, opportunism, inspiration, and belief in a better future. In the introduction translated here, the author explains that the Greeks find it difficult to communicate with each other. The reason for this is the distortion that the Greek language has suffered since

ancient times and especially after the ‘enslavement’ by the Ottomans. As a result, it has become a mixture of different dialects, which has made it impossible for Greeks of one stock—*genos*—to communicate with Greeks from another. The aim of the play is to counter this distortion by presenting its funny side but not ridiculing it, and to promote the education of the nation, by encouraging the officials to establish schools. However, Vyzantios rejects the perpetuation of the purist tradition and urges the employment of the vernacular. At the same time, by bringing on stage all these characters, who originated from such diverse areas but still formed part of the same collectivity, he maps the boundaries of the nation. Unlike, though, the irredentist discourse, which will be introduced a few years later by the official state ideology, Vyzantios does not make any claim regarding the liberation of these populations. His main concern is the creation of stronger linguistic and cultural ties among them, and not to challenge political authority. In this sense, we could trace the origins of his discourse in earlier works of Phanariot Enlightenment authors, for instance, **Katartzis**.

The play became one of the best-known comedies of Modern Greek theater. Famous directors like Fotos Politis and Karolos Koun have presented it, and there has even been a film based on it.

VK

Babel, or the local distortion of the Greek language: A comedy

To the Readers

The corruption of the Greek language began in other, more ancient times, but under Roman rule the corruption was much greater, while the tyranny of the Ottomans was the cause of its utter corruption.

In the land of European Turkey, as well as in the islands of the Mediterranean, the Greek language is known only to a few educated [people], while it is spoken mixed with Turkish, Albanian, Illyrian, and, in the Ionian islands, with Italian.

In Asia it is not heard, save in the churches, except in certain provinces and the coastlines of Ionia, Phrygia, and Bithynia¹, but even there [it is spoken] with the greatest corruption.

¹ The names of Roman provinces in Asia Minor, which are still in use in the Greek language.

This ignorance and distortion of the spoken language into the monstrosity which is spoken in certain parts were brought on by the illiteracy which took over the Greek nation due to the lack of schools and the means to disseminate education.

From the time when schools were established in Chios, Smyrna, Kydonies², Chania³, Jannina, Constantinople and other parts (may the memory of those who established them live forever!), the Greek language began to be introduced into the spoken language and gradually to beautify it.

Moreover, from the time of the holy struggle for independence to the present day, with the care of the nation's few educated [men], the spoken language was improved in the way it was written and in the way it was spoken by many.

But, despite all this, very few are those who speak it perfectly, while the majority speaks it with the same corruption with which they spoke it before its improvement.

It is funny, but also sad, to see a social gathering of different Greeks, that is to say Chiots, Cretans, Albanians, Byzantines,⁴ Orientals, Ionian islanders and others, whereupon the one mixes in Turkish words, the other Italian ones, the other Albanian ones, the other corrupted ones, and in the same gathering, while they are all Greek, they cannot understand each other without the use of a translation or an explanation of each word as it is uttered, with the gathering thus turning into a Babel.

Not wishing to make a tragedy out of this regrettable state into which the Greek language has degenerated, I decided to make a comedy, in order for those who speak the Greek language badly to learn by amusement and to urge the establishment of schools in different places in order to teach their youth, rather than by censure and bitter reproach, which, of course, would displease them.

I do not aim at ridiculing the characters appearing on stage, but, as I said, at teaching and at urging the dissemination of knowledge.

And in order that I not be perceived as wishing for ancient Greek to be spoken in a pedantic way, so that it could not be understood at all, I introduce onto the stage a pedantic Man of Letters, to prove that the pedantic manner of speech amidst the spoken language provokes disgust, and even more so when

² Present-day Ayvalık, on the northwestern coast of Turkey.

³ Town in Crete.

⁴ Originating from Byzantium, namely Constantinople. The term was also used in this sense until the demise of the Ottoman Empire.

one talks to groups of people who are not educated, since, being wrongly perceived by them, it produces laughter.

I did not introduce many types of Greeks onto the stage, limiting myself only to those who mix in the Turkish language, typified by the Oriental; those who mix in the Italian language and the European dialects, typified by the Ionian islander; those who mix in the Albanian language, typified by the Albanian; and those who use corrupted words together with everyone else, so that when one hears a Byzantine or a Smyrniot, or someone else uttering the odd Turkish word, then one can know him to be the Oriental. For, in many places in Constantinople, the speech of the Byzantines is not very different to that of the Orientals, and so on and so forth with the rest of them, as well as the illiterate doctor and the women, who belong to the category of those who speak a corrupted language.

Those reading this comedy should try, as far as possible, to pronounce it in the way that the people appearing on stage do, in order to preserve its elegance and funniness.

I would like to ask my readers to forgive the shortcomings of this [comedy], and I promise that I will please them more fully with my comedy of *Sinasis*, which will be published next.

Translated by Mary Kitroeff

HENRYK RZEWUSKI: MORAL VARIETIES

Title: *Mieszaniny obyczajowe przez Jarosza Bejłę* (Moral varieties by Jarosz Bejła), vol. 1.

Originally published: Wilno, Teofil Glücksberg, 1841

Language: Polish

The excerpts used are from the original, pp. 17–22.

About the author

Henryk Rzewuski [1791, Sławuta (*Ukr.* Slavuta, present-day Ukraine) – 1866, Cudnów (*Ukr.* Chudniv, present-day Ukraine)]: writer and politician. Rzewuski was born into an aristocratic family known for its extreme traditionalism (his father belonged to the most radical critics of the Great Diet). Educated by a French royalist refugee, he was under the direct intellectual influence of European conservatism (above all, from Joseph de Maistre, whom Rzewuski knew personally). In one of his travels to the Mediterranean, Rzewuski met **Adam Mickiewicz**, who is said to have inspired his most popular book, *Pamiętki Soplicy* (The memories of Soplica). Rzewuski's sequence of stories in the old-fashioned 'Sarmatian' style was a nostalgic novel on the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, its internal political system and—above all—on the unique lifestyle of the gentry (see also **Adam Mickiewicz**, *Pan Tadeusz*). The publication of *Mieszaniny obyczajowe* shocked Polish readers. In this essay Rzewuski negated the national existence of Poles. Immediately after publishing it, Rzewuski joined a conservative pro-Russian society and began to publish in the society's gazette *Tygodnik Petersburski* (St. Petersburg weekly). From 1850 he worked as the personal secretary of Ivan Paskievitch, the Russian governor of the 'Congress Kingdom,' and started publishing an official newspaper *Dziennik Warszawski* (Warsaw daily). After 1856, he returned to his family estate and spent the rest of his life in Cudnów. Despite his controversial political life, Rzewuski became one of the most popular authors of historical novels (the successful *Pamiętki Soplicy* was only the beginning in that genre). After his retirement to Cudnów, Rzewuski also turned to the composition of very professional historical falsifications of eighteenth century diaries (*Pamiętniki Bartłomieja Michałowskiego*).

Main works: *Pamiętki Soplicy* [The memories of Soplica] (1839–1841); *Wędrowki umysłowe* [Intellectual travels] 2 vols., (1851); *Mieszaniny obyczajowe* [Moral varieties] 2 vols., (1841–1843); *Listopad* [November] 2 vols., (1845–1846); *Próbki historyczne* [Historical Sketches] (1868); *Teofrast polski* [The Polish Theophrastus] 2 vols., (1851); *Zamek Krakowski* [Cracow Castle] 3 vols., (1847–8); *Adam*

Śmigielski 2 vols., (1851); *Rycerz Lizdejko* [The Knight Lizdejko] 3 vols., (1851–52); *Pamiętniki Bartłomieja Michałowskiego* [The memories of Bartłomiej Michałowski] 5 vols., (1857).

Context

The following text represents a pro-Russian political program in radical contrast to the plans and proclamations of the Polish democratic émigrés. In the 1840s Henryk Rzewuski belonged to the so-called *Koteria Petersburska* ('St. Petersburg coterie,' a conservative circle around the gazette *Tygodnik Petersburski*), which declared its full support for the tsar's policies. Using an organicist language to describe 'national existence,' he made the shocking pronouncement that Poland was dead because she no longer had a *raison d'être*. He argued that the attempts to reform the *Rzeczpospolita* during the Enlightenment failed, thus ending Poland's political existence and depriving her of a historical role. His text brought together two streams of conservatism: Polish aristocratic 'republicanism,' as represented by Rzewuski's father, and contemporary conservative utopianism, a radical response to the trauma of the French Revolution and the romantic ideologies of radical social transformation. With these ideological tools, Rzewuski criticized all attempts to restore independence by national revolution and considered the death of Poland a fact, something which could be even a potential source of spiritual values. He saw the future in the assimilation of the Poles into the Russian nation and in their subordination to the Russian tsar. According to Rzewuski, monarchic power in general had spiritual roots, and this was especially true of the tsar.

He addressed two groups simultaneously: the Russian ruling elite and the Polish public. Nevertheless, his petitions and other attempts to garner favor with the Russians did not excite serious interest in Russia. Furthermore, Polish intellectual circles felt deeply offended by Rzewuski's central idea, and he became a *persona non grata* among the Polish émigrés. His intellectual sources, for example, de Maistre's conservatism, were little known among the Polish elite; as a result, the reviewers of his book usually restricted their reaction to outpourings of patriotic fury, often dealing with Rzewuski's theories without reference to their theoretical foundations and assuming that *Mieszaniny*... was to be dismissed as mere nonsense.

Not surprisingly, Rzewuski does not belong to the canonized heroes of national memory, and his works (with the exception of *Pamiętki Soplicy*) did not run to second editions. Even though organicist nationalism had a power-

ful impact on Polish political thought from the turn of the twentieth century onwards, this part of the Polish intellectual heritage was rediscovered relatively late. In the 1970s Wojciech Karpiński and Marcin Król started to research Polish conservative ideology. From the point of view of Polish identity discourse, Rzewuski came to be compared to Rosa Luxemburg, as both negated the very idea of the independence of Poland on the basis of universalist theories. In Luxemburg's case, it was the Marxist utopia that led her to criticize Polish socialism for its 'nationalist tendency.' In her opinion, the Polish working class had to seek the solution to its problems within the Russian Empire. For Rzewuski, national ideology was overwritten by a conservative utopia, and it was Russia that was meant to secure traditional social order and save the world from revolution. Consequently, although the two were on different sides of the ideological spectrum, Polish reactions to both Rzewuski's and Luxemburg's theories were surprisingly similar.

MG

Moral varieties by Jarosz Bejła

[...] The nations' vital powers sleep in their wombs, and as soon as they are recognized these nations will metamorphose themselves into independent powerful bodies. In the spirit of this truth a peasant unites with a genius, while the poets, artists and philosophers influence the masses that have nothing in common with poetry, art, or philosophy. Unenlightened as they are, the common people do sense the presence of the sublime, for if it were only the property of the wise and privileged, all poetry, art and philosophy would be unvaried. And, as it is national in character, it necessarily reflects a distinctly local atmosphere and the unique emotions and dreams of the masses. The wide influence of the Encyclopaedic movement in France during the last century, the magnetism of Schiller, Goethe and Hegel in Germany, and the impact of Byron and Walter Scott on people in England, was not merely the effect of popularizing education in these fortunate countries—the influence of Saadi, Hafiz and Averroes on their ignorant countrymen was no less. Their magnetism resulted rather from a general tendency of every vital nation to strive instinctively towards achieving a historical presence; a nation cannot but admire the unique individuals through whom its presence is made possible, and the masses seem to have an infallible and indestructible sixth sense for identifying them.

In our country, which has never seen as many great poets and outstanding thinkers and writers as it does now, the exceptional individuals have not only

gained no recognition among their fellow countrymen, with whom they share both language and everyday reality, but, what is more, they have isolated themselves from society, often adopting an eccentric lifestyle, and seek only each other's appreciation while distancing themselves from the masses who do not understand them and whom they gradually cease to understand as well. One may say that a literature that is so rich, and yet does not exert any impact on society, must be indeed an anomaly in the course of human history. Yet, anomaly it is not—rather, it is a phenomenon which is natural and easy to explain.

An individual being is born, matures, grows weak and eventually dies. As a collective being, a nation undergoes the same process. Similarly to an individual being, a collective one possesses a soul, and this soul is the spirit of the nation. A nation endures, despite all appearances, until the spirit leaves its flesh. And this body is the entirety of individuals who create the nation. When an individual being dies, his soul enters eternity to face the judgement of the Lord and Savior, while his deserted body, devoid of inner integrating force, begins to rot; abhorrent vermin devour the corpse until it vanishes from sight, only to become part of new organisms. With the destruction of the last atom of the carcass the mystery of death is complete—the curtain is brought down and all that remains is a handful of ashes.

Now, as long as a collective being (a social body) has a soul (its spirit), it will manifest all features of a living organism. Being part of a collective being, every man, whether he is a hero, a thinker, a scientist, a craftsman or a peasant, participates in it in a manner permitted by his social status, and his participation is in harmony with that of his fellow countrymen, even if they are divided by intellectual differences. This harmony becomes their common denominator and endows the nation with a distinct historical physiognomy. For the most part, there seems to be in society, despite its detours, a general tendency towards that which is outstanding, noble, and useful for the people, and this tendency compensates for all personal animosities. In a harmonious society, the individuals educated as poets, artists, writers and philosophers will not only find popularity and appreciation with their compatriots, but also love and respect for their unique ability to express the common spirit that animates the entire society.

When death comes upon the collective being of a nation, its soul does not enter eternity similarly to the soul of an individual, because there is no after-life for nations. However, on departing the body of society, the national spirit commemorates its death with a final act that no longer involves society's participation. Like a patient on his deathbed who becomes incredibly vital in the

last moments before death, so does the spirit of a dying nation find a way to inspire the minds of the wise into making a last titanic effort to compose a eulogy. The great minds of such a nation, living out of touch with their society, which does not admire them, and from which they distance themselves, weave the intellectual threads out of their own minds, because the fabric is not to be found in society. As a result, as if by a miracle there appears a rich and varied literature, a literature where one finds, instead of affection for the present, hopeless visions of the future, a literature of nostalgia in which the old legends and past artifacts become resurrected by some unnatural force. Strangely enough, this literature, this collection of the most bizarre literary acts unnoticed by the public eye, is characterized by a certain emotional uniformity, by a single poetics of sorrow, despair and fearful prophecies. This is because this literature is the last cry of the nation's spirit from the underworld, the nation's last effort after which silence will befall it. And the silence will prevail until the deceased nation mingles with the previously foreign elemental forces and speaks again, though this time in another language. Its own language will take its final form and join the Sanskrit, Hellenic, Celtic and Roman languages to be one which used to express the thoughts of living societies but which today are no more than monuments erected in their memory.

As to physical disintegration, the death of a nation's collective body bears even greater resemblance to that of an individual. Devoid of the divine spirit which breathed life, harmony and energy into it, the nation's carcass is also ravaged by merciless vermin, that is, by secret organizations which desperately try to find the last surviving scraps of the decaying corpse. Initially, the vermin are numerous, because the body they penetrate is still fresh, but as time passes they reach and destroy its deepest insides—first, there are the *Filareci* and the *Promieniści*, then the patriotic groups such as the *Kosonierzy* and the *Templars*. Finally, there come the *Skórkowy* and the *Baragoły*, whose functions better than anything else speak for their aims and actions; the former deals with cattle, the latter is a Jewish servant. Nothing can be worse than that.¹ [...]

Translated by Zuzanna Ładyga

¹ Rzewuski enumerates secret societies, starting with student organizations and ending with socially radical groups of 'rabble.'

ĽUDOVÍT ŠTÚR: THE SLOVAK DIALECT, OR THE NECESSITY OF WRITING IN THIS DIALECT

Title: *Nárečja slovenskuo alebo potreba písanja v tomto nárečí* (The Slovak dialect, or the necessity of writing in this dialect)

Originally published: Pressburg, Wigand, 1846

Language: Slovak

The excerpts used are from Ľudovít Štúr, *Dielo v piatich zväzkoch*, vol. V, (Bratislava: SVKL, 1957), pp. 24–114.

About the author

Ľudovít Štúr [1815, Uhrovec (*Hun.* Zayugróc, present-day Slovakia) – 1856, Modra (*Hun.* Modor, *Ger.* Modern, present-day Slovakia)]: poet, politician, linguist and journalist. He was born into the family of a Lutheran teacher. He attended grammar school in Győr, and later enrolled at the Lutheran lyceum in Pressburg (*Hun.* Pozsony, *Slo.* Prešporok, today Bratislava). Later, as deputy professor at the ‘Department of Czecho-Slavic Language and Literature’ at the Pressburg lyceum he taught the history of Slavic literature and founded the ‘Institute of the Czechoslovak Language’ there. In 1838 he went to the University of Halle in Germany, where he came under the influence of the ideas of Herder and Hegel. In 1842 he initiated the first Slovak petition (*Slovenský prestolný prosbopis*) to the Court in Vienna, demanding that the government prevent the Hungarians from persecuting the Slovaks. One year later, Štúr and his friends decided to codify a standard Slovak language (based on the central Slovak dialect), for which in his *Náuka reči slovenskej* (Theory of the Slovak language) Štúr elaborated a grammatical and orthographic system. After he was deprived of his lecturership at the lyceum, he became a private scholar and founded the first Slovak political newspaper, *Slovenskje narodnje novini* (Slovak national newspaper), which included an important literary supplement, *Orol tatranský* (The eagle of Tatra). From November 1847 to April 1848 he was a member of the Hungarian Diet in Pressburg. In 1848 he was active in organizing the Slavic Congress in Prague and initiated the foundation of *Slovanská lípa* (The Slavic lime-tree), an association aimed at promoting mutual cooperation among the Slavs. During the early phase of the 1848 revolution, he supported the program of the democratization of Hungarian political life and the federalization of the Empire, which should bring Slovakia autonomous status. In May 1848 he was among the initiators of the official petition *Žiadosti slovenského národa* (**Requests of the Slovak Nation**), demanding Slovak autonomy within Hungary. From September 1848 till November 1849, Štúr took part in the political and military activities of the Slovak uprising

against the Hungarian government, hoping that the Habsburgs would make it possible for an autonomous Slovak entity to be created. However, the neo-absolutist regime introduced by Vienna after the defeat of the Hungarian Revolution in 1849 proved to be equally unwilling to implement his demands. Prevented from public activity, he moved to Modra near Pressburg, where he lived under police surveillance. He continued his work on the codification of the Slovak language, while his political position radicalized in the direction of pan-Slavism, as witnessed by his book *Das Slawenthum und die Welt der Zukunft*, published posthumously in Russia in 1867. Štúr was the main creator of the political program of the Slovak national movement and modern Slovak national ideology, which was closely connected with the issue of the separation of the Slovak language from Czech. To this day he is referred to as the central personality in Slovak national ideology.

Main works: *Dumky večerní* [Evening thoughts] (1838–1840); *Die Beschwerden und Klagen der Slaven in Ungarn über die gesetzwidrigen Übergriffe der Magyaren* [Complaints and grievances of the Slavs in Hungary regarding the illegal encroachments of the Magyars] (1843); *Das neunzehnte Jahrhundert und der Magyarismus* [The nineteenth century and Magyarism] (1845); *Nářečja slovenskuo alebo potreba písanija v tomto nářečí* [The Slovak dialect, or the necessity of writing in this dialect] (1846); *Náuka reči slovenskej* [Theory of the Slovak language] (1846); *O národních písních a pověstech plemen slovanských* [On the national songs and myths of the Slavic races] (1853); *Spevy a piesne* [Hymns and songs] (1853); *Das Slawenthum und die Welt der Zukunft* [Slavdom and the world of the future] (German original 1931, Russian translation 1867, Slovak translation 1993).

Context

During the Hungarian Reform Age (1825–1848), the Magyar political leadership sought to reformulate the traditional *natio hungarica*—referring originally to the Hungarian nobility—into a notion of a modern political nation embracing all ethnic communities living on the territory of ‘St. Stephen’s Crown.’ However, their efforts to centralize the state and to establish Magyar as the language of official communication provoked negative reactions among non-Magyar peoples and strengthened their emancipatory aspirations. For the emerging Slovak intelligentsia this development encouraged the endeavor to unify the two major confessional streams, Catholic and Lutheran, in the Slovak national movement. The former, representing in denominational terms the majority of the Slovaks, used a specific literary form of Slovak (‘*berňolákovčina*’), codified by Anton Bernolák (1762–1813) at the end of the eighteenth century, and nurtured a vision of the Slovaks as an autonomous tribe in the family of the great Slavic nation. The latter, in contrast, who had a stronger following among the cultural elite and the urban population, were in favor of the language they themselves used for religious purposes, namely ‘biblical Czech,’ and shared the view that the Czechs, Moravians and Slovaks were all one single tribe of the Slavic nation.

At the beginning of the 1830s, an indisputable authority in the Slovak national movement, respected also by the Roman Catholic intellectuals, was the poet and linguist **Ján Kollár**, a supporter of Czech-Slovak tribal unity and of the use of the Czech language. During the 1830s, however, a new generation of Slovak patriots entered public life, including Ľudovít Štúr, Jozef Miloslav Hurban (1817–1888) and Michal Miloslav Hodža (1811–1870). The majority of them had passed through the Lutheran lyceum in Pressburg, where the Czech-Slavic Society, founded in 1829, initiated them into the ideas of the national movement. In 1835, however, when Štúr, the leading personality of the new generation, took over the presidency of the Society, the previous Kollárian ideas were gradually replaced by a more consistent and politically oriented Slovak nationalism. Štúr recognized that the unification of the Slovaks was possible only on the basis of a unified literary language used by the whole Slavic population in Upper Hungary. At the same time, he stressed that Slovakized Czech, the language of educated Lutherans, was not enough to form the basis of a national program and at the same time was far from the everyday language of the Slovak peasants. Hence, he chose the Central Slovak dialect as the basis of a literary Slovak and, together with Hurban and Hodža, he decided to work out a linguistic framework for this codification project.

In his critical essay, *Nárečja slovenskuo*, written in 1843 but published three years later, Štúr rejects **Kollár**'s concept of only four distinct Slavic tribes (Russians, Poles, Czechoslovaks and Southern Slavs) and insisted additionally on the distinctive character of the Slovaks. He lists reasons for the introduction of a new language based on a dialect spoken in the Central Slovakian areas and for the use of a phonetic spelling. In Štúr's thought, the Herderian idea that a nation's individuality mirrors its belonging to mankind overlapped with the reception of the Hegelian principle of the Absolute Spirit, unfolding in self-knowledge. Hence, he argued that the spirit of a particular nation was expressed by its language and indigenous cultural achievements. The originality (*svojbytnosť*) of the Slovak "national spirit" was thus based on the "organic principle" of language, which, however, had to be based on an indigenous dialect. He considered the introduction of a unified Slovak language and the creation of a specific Slovak identity a way to break the 'ahistoricity' of the Slovaks and turn them from a passive object into an active subject of history and a part of the *Weltgeist*.

Štúr's proposal was fiercely disapproved of by **Kollár** and also by many Czech nationalists who saw it as an act of unjustifiable separatism and a weakening of solidarity and the power of the national movement. However, the majority of Slovak intellectuals, including the Catholics (represented by

the leading figure of Bernolák's group, the poet Ján Hollý), welcomed the act of codification. The standard language became an important political tool, since it finally provided a basis for a program of unification of the two streams of the Slovak national movement and contributed significantly to the formation of a modern, universally conceptualized Slovak national identity.

PL-MK

The Slovak dialect, or the necessity of writing in this dialect

Centuries and centuries passed while we, the Slovaks, showed no signs of life or only sporadic and weak ones. Praised be God, the time of inertia of our nation is ending and we are more and more wakeful and embarking on our own voyage on the wings of spiritual life. Never before, however, has the awakening been so striking as it is in our time, as observation of our recent national endeavor rightly shows. Never before have so many scholarly works been published. Never before has the love for the country of our Slovak men and especially of the youth been so devoted and fervent. Never before has anybody noted so much desire in our nation to discover itself and the entire world. As this time in which our new life will be born is extremely important for us, it is necessary to reconsider thoroughly in which way we should start this new life so that it might—as much as we can influence it—evolve successfully. First and foremost, it is striking that up to this day we have written not in our own but in another nation's dialect; how could our national life possibly be built upon such a dialect? We can create our life in full only upon the basis of our own dialect; for it is closest to our hearts, it is most understandable to us, it has the fullest connection to our inner being and inspires us to the greatest openness. Therefore, we have to embrace this dialect of ours at the outset of our new life and grow spiritually in it. [...]

We had our Slovak people, to whom we devoted most of our efforts, in mind when we made the decision, in contrast to the past ages, to use the Slovak dialect and not the literary language as the basis for writing our own books. All will rightly expect from us a complete explanation of the reasons we had for taking this step; therefore, we consider it proper to give our audience an account of why we decided on Slovak, for which, as will be seen in our explanation, we had sufficiently serious reasons.

Foremost, we have to turn our attention to the multi-tribal nature [*kmenovitost*] (die Gliederung in Stämme, divisio in stirpes) of our Slavic nation

which is of a higher level and more extensive than in any other nation. Thus, the Slavic nation is tree-like *katexochen*,¹ as they say, and of a diverse character. This multi-tribal nature represents in every nation, where it exists, a sign of great spiritual power, vitality and healthy progress. [...]

The multi-tribal nature is thus a praiseworthy and distinguished feature of a nation, testifying to its higher spirituality and spiritual vitality, and it must be, therefore, as far as possible preserved, protected and carefully developed anywhere it exists. Where there is this multi-tribal nature and it is allowed to develop on its own, there will always be found in a nation a flowering and unfolding spiritual life which resembles a budding and healthy tree. We must care deeply for the multi-tribal nature of our nation if we want to realize the capability hidden in its roots and promised by world history, otherwise the Slavic nation will not prosper and will, instead of richly flowering, suffer in its numerous branches, like a plant which grows in unfertile soil, seeming to grow but in fact, as we Slovaks say, only rotting and scraping along. When it is considered properly, we have to demand firmly that our Slavic nation develops in the same way as it has grown, that is, that it grows in a multitude of branches, as only in this way will its existence be independent, neither scrubby nor unnaturally lanky, but grown truly organically and successfully. Therefore, our most deeply felt request is that the Slavic tribes be allowed to build their spiritual life upon their own dialects, that is, that they would write in their dialects and thus through them demonstrate in front of God, the world, and Slavdom what they truly are. There are eleven Slavic tribes and living dialects. To the southeast Slavs belong: 1. The Great Russians, 2. The Small Russians, 3. The Bulgarians, 4. The Serbs, 5. The Croats, 6. The Slovenians; to the northeast Slavs belong: 7. The Poles, 8. The Czechs, 9. The Upper Lusatians, 10. The Lower Lusatians and finally 11. we, the Slovaks, with our own Slovak dialect. We do not mean that every small and weak tribe should write in its own dialect; but we demand that each tribe which has something specific and spiritual, whose dialect is still pure, untainted and unspoiled, and is capable of written form, and which is able to sustain spiritually and materially its own literature, in short, that every such tribe should develop its own dialect, produce in it its spiritual fruits and present itself to the face of the Slavic world. [...]

The self-understanding of a nation is like a secure fortress which will endure and survive all possible attacks. Since a nation which has reached self-

¹ From Greek: above all, especially.

understanding is integrated by a powerful spiritual force, such a nation will not allow itself to be dishonoured and besmeared, it will insist on its existence and on its just standing among the other nations, since it is a spiritually vital nation. In our days, after centuries of drowsiness the Slavic tribes have awakened to spiritual life as if called by the trumpet of an archangel. And the Slovaks too were awakened and began to see themselves as a nation. And even though there are still many things to endure and survive we will eventually be able to exclaim with a clear voice after centuries of passivity or of mere survival: We have overcome the greatest danger! Oh, our time has finally come too! Our age has arrived too! But if we had had no other protection against the danger than the bond with the other tribe through the literary language, we would not have been safe, as this bond is still rather posited outside of us. The true bond is the spiritual bond, and the best shield against danger is our own strength—which is precisely what we want to awaken in our Slovak tribe, speaking to it in its own dialect, which speaks to the heart and speaks to the soul. For these reasons, therefore, we believe that Kollár's mutuality, limited to the four tribes, is no longer valid and no longer needed, and we extend the delineation of the mutuality among our tribes, as he himself deep in his heart wanted, but never articulated in the way we did above.

Translated by Petr Roubal and Gordon MacLean

JEVREM GRUJIĆ AND MILOVAN JANKOVIĆ: SOUTH SLAVS, OR THE SERBIAN NATION WITH THE CROATS AND THE BULGARIANS

Title: *Slaves du Sud ou le peuple Serbe avec les Croates et les Bulgares* (South Slavs, or the Serbian nation with the Croats and the Bulgarians)

Originally published: Paris, Lacourte et c., 1853

Language: French

Excerpts used are from the modern edition: Nikola F. Pavković, ed., *Etnografski zapisi Jevrema Grujića* (Belgrade: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, 1992), pp. 155–165.

About the authors

Jevrem Grujić [1826, Darosava (near Kragujevac) – 1895, Belgrade]: politician. His background is indicative of the social profile of the incipient political class in Serbia in the first half of the nineteenth century: his grandfather took part in the First and the Second Serbian Uprisings, his father was a merchant and high-ranking state official, while Jevrem himself belonged to the first generation of native Serbian intelligentsia with foreign university diplomas. His elementary schooling was irregular due to the duties he had to perform in his family household. Later, in his writings, memories from childhood came to have an important place. In 1841 he enrolled in the Gymnasium in Belgrade and in 1846 in the Lyceum. As a student in Belgrade, he actively participated in the foundation—in 1847—of the youth organization *Družina mladeži srpske* (Association of Serbian Youth). In 1849 he obtained a scholarship from the Serbian government and went to Heidelberg to study law. A year later he moved to Paris to continue his studies. There, together with another law student from Serbia, Milovan Janković, he published a book, *Slaves du Sud*, that so enraged the Serbian authorities that they eventually cancelled his stipend. He nevertheless finished law school in 1854 and returned to Belgrade. In 1858 Grujić entered politics as a secretary of the so-called ‘St. Andrew’s National Assembly’ (*Svetoandrejska skupština*), which later overthrew Prince Alexander Karađorđević. Grujić led the liberal wing of deputies, which promulgated a new law whereby the National Assembly would be held regularly and elected by popular vote. During the rule of the Obrenović dynasty he held several important official positions, such as Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs (1859) and Minister of Justice (1860). His outspoken liberalism, however, brought him harassment and also imprisonment. Grujić was one of the founders in 1867 and first president of the ‘United Serbian Youth’ (*Ujedinjena Omladina Srpska*). He

also featured among the founders of the Liberal party and served as its leader between 1868 and 1878. During the Serbo-Turkish war (1876–1878) he held the post of Prime Minister. He ended his political career as the Serbian ambassador to Paris in 1892. He is considered as one of the most important representatives of liberalism, parliamentarism and constitutionalism in Serbia.

Main works: *Slaves du Sud ou le peuple Serbe avec les Croates et les Bulgares* (1853); *Uspomene* [Memories] (1864); *Zapisi* [Writings] 3 vols., (1922–1923).

Milovan Janković [1828, Vlaška – 1899, Belgrade]: politician. Janković, who had been studying philosophy and political science in Germany and France met Jevrem Grujić in Paris. There in 1853 they together published *Slaves de Sud*. In 1854 Janković started working as a state employee and in 1856 obtained a position as a teacher of economics. In 1858, together with Grujić, Janković entered politics, actively participating in the so-called St. Andrew's National Assembly which overthrew Prince Alexander Karađorđević. Janković supported Grujić, who led the liberal wing of deputies. Under the regime of Prince Miloš Obrenović (r. 1817–1839, 1858–1860), he worked initially as Miloš's secretary, but eventually fell into disgrace and decided to leave the country. He came back to Serbia only after the death of Mihajlo Obrenović (r. 1860–1868), Miloš's successor. Janković once again entered government service, rising to the position of Minister of Finances which he held for a few months in 1875. He continued to hold various positions until 1889, when he retired.

Main works: *Srbski car – Stjepane* [Stephen – the Serbian tsar] (1868); *Hoće li 'biti il' nebiti' srpstva?* [The 'to be or not to be' of the Serbians] (1891); *Šta je čije?* [What is whose?] (1891).

Context

Jevrem Grujić was among the first Serbian students who were sent on state grants to study at West European universities during the 1840s and 1850s. The members of this generation of students liked to differentiate themselves from the Serbian intelligentsia and state functionaries 'imported' from neighboring Austria and educated mainly at German-speaking universities, whom they resentfully called "*nemačkari*." This first generation of Serbian-born intelligentsia, being educated mainly in France, perceived themselves as the true transmitters of Western political and cultural models and as mediators of Western ideological influence. They returned to Serbia with the firm conviction that their state could progress only if they adopted the liberal political institutions of the West, of which representative government and civil rights were the most important attributes. The encounter of West European political ideas with Serbian social realities resulted in a reformulation of liberal ideological precepts to fit the 'national context.' In their efforts to legitimate the readiness of Serbian

society to accept the principles and institutions of liberalism, Serbian liberals turned to their national history, seeking to find in it “the rudiments of Western liberal institutions.” These “rudiments” were to be found in the “freedom-loving” institutions of patriarchal life that would provide for conformity with the values of modern liberalism and democracy and for continuity in political development. Constitutionalism and representative government were directly derived from these traditions of popular democracy.

Slaves du Sud should not be considered separately from Grujić’s other important work, ‘Memories.’ Some researchers on the subject maintain that *Slaves du Sud*, a study rich in ethnographic data and information about contemporary social and political life in Serbia, should be considered an introduction to the later ‘Memories,’ which deals with life in one particular community, Grujić’s native village of Darosava. The aim of the two authors was to inform the Western audience, and especially the French, of the historical past and the political, social and religious realities in Serbia at the time. The style of *Slaves du Sud* indicates that it was not written with any serious scholarly pretensions. Rather, it was based on a strong emotional and national commitment and on the need to clarify the political position of Serbia in a sensitive geopolitical context. Nevertheless, the text contains useful ethnographic data about social life and customs in Serbia in the first half of the nineteenth century, and it represents the first synthetic description of some important aspects of the social relations and, to some extent, the religious life of the Serbs. The Serbian patriarchal cultural model is emphasized and Serbian laws and customs are understood as “the best laws,” a notion that Grujić himself will rectify in the ‘Memories,’ where he pays more attention to situations of social conflict and economic inequality. This shift certainly reflects the changing socio-political circumstances in Serbia, but can also be attributed to the change of his own position in the course of those years. Grujić had personal experience of the severity of the ruling regime’s reaction when confronted with demands for political reforms, and ‘Memories’ was written during his imprisonment in 1863–1864.

Slaves du Sud seeks to explain the most important features of Serbian traditional life. Starting with a list of the rights that belong to the people, reflected in political, economical, legal, and moral norms, the authors go on to describe other important social institutions, such as the village community, folk customs, festivals and games. They pay particular attention to folk songs and the system of traditional beliefs. The text finishes with a description of the most important ‘spiritual’ features of the Serbian people. Serbian customs are judged “good and benign,” rooted in “moral, philosophical, legal, eco-

nostic and religious principles." A Serbian man is trustful, proud to bear arms and always ready to gather and celebrate. In conclusion, the authors stress again the importance of inner and outer liberty for the Serbs and the meaning of the cultural and historical continuity that is achieved through nurturing traditions and epic poetry.

The publication of *Slaves du Sud* was important not just because it represented the first ethnographic synthesis of Serbian folk culture and mentality, but because it created a normative image of it. Most of all, the book focuses on the rituals of the life-cycle which also figure as important communal events, such as the wedding, the funeral and the celebration of the patron-saints, the so-called *slava*. The text emphasizes the rationality of the Serbs, asserting that "the Serbs are free of absurd ideas," and stresses their close family ties and their obedience to the customary law of the community. These aspects will be taken up and further elaborated in the later works of the outstanding ethnographers Milan Đ. Milićević (*Život Srba seljak*; The life of the Serbian peasants) (1894) and Vladimir Karić (*Srbija—opis zemlje, naroda i države*; Serbia—Description of the country, people and the state) (1887). In the characteristic sociographic key of late-nineteenth century ethnology rather than in line with Grujić's and Janković's depiction of an idyllic South Slav utopia, Milićević and Karić gave substantial and lasting synthetic descriptions of the traditional life of the Serbian village and villagers. Their works have remained essential for subsequent historical, ethnographical and sociological research.

IE

Popular opinion

The Serbian people are free of absurd ideas. There is no such thing as a proletariat amongst us. Life evolves in the family. The people do not need newspapers. Opinion is formed amongst the people themselves. They have true judgment as their guide and inflexible conscience to prevent wrongdoing. In our country there is no need for laws on freedom of speech and assembly in order to ensure that everyone has the right to the expression of individual conviction. Nor is there any need for laws governing the carrying of weapons. Laws of prohibition are not necessary either. Our customs are the best laws for us. We are accustomed to gathering together. It is a particular characteristic of ours and it is in the interest of the life of the people.

Our customs are good and benign. If interpreted properly, moral, philosophical, legal, economic and religious principles can be found in them. Based on national feelings and shrouded in some kind of secret formula which warns: “that’s right, that’s not right,” and “that must be done,” as well as asking: “why”—these principles are preserved in the consciousness of the people and are passed from generation to generation. The Serbian child learns these principles from his or her mother while being brought up. And when he later enters social life, he does not hesitate to respect these truths and hastens to instill them into his own children, and so it goes on.

A Serb is a man of his word; he can be trusted. In his “toasts,” he drinks to the health of his friends and his enemies, praying to God that the former should not change and that the latter should be shown the right path.

Weapons are the decorations of a Serbian home. It was once necessary to carry arms when travelling, and this fine custom of owning arms also exists today. This is because a Serb is equally proud to bear arms at festivities and when attending assemblies.

A Serb expresses:

1. His inner freedom in “agreements amongst village leaders,” with the “supreme leader,” and particularly in the areas of community activity upon which the community decides freely for itself.

2. His outer freedom in the use of the title “emperor” to be held by a head of state, but a head of state of Serb origin, a leader who would come from the people and would be its personification. Otherwise, he would not be a “leader” of the people but a master, a Turk, even if he were a Slav.

Finally, the people firmly believe in their future. They live in a thought that is sacred to them. Whatever misfortune may befall the Serbian nation, nothing can remove that hope that is life itself to them.

Mothers lull their children to sleep with songs that instill hope in their “infant sons” that when they grow up and leave their mothers they will form part of an “emperor’s army” (an army led by a Serbian emperor) and conquer the enemies of the homeland.

Children grow up, men live out their lives and old men die in the thought: “when will the Serbian empire come?”¹

¹ During the time of Karađorđe, when the voivode (military leader) Kursula was dying from wounds he had suffered, the other voivode asked him: “Kursula, our brother, you will soon die, tell us what you regret most in this world?” “I do not regret having to die,” replied the dying hero, “I do not regret having to leave my family and this earth, but what I do regret is dying and not knowing what will happen to this Serbia of ours.”

Everything is done to ensure that this idea is preserved and passed from generation to generation. This is what, in that sense, a young man wrote in a letter on the subject of our folk epic poetry: "I see tears flowing on the faces of all those who have demanded the return of Kosovo. That helped us, that breathed life into us. We breathe in the air of Kosovo to prevent it being difficult when we arrive there."

Translated by Krištof Bodrič

SIMION BĂRNUȚIU: THE PUBLIC LAW OF THE ROMANIANS

Title: *Dreptul public al românilor* (The public law of the Romanians)

Originally published: Iași, Tip. Tribunei Române, 1867. The work was published posthumously.

Language: Romanian

The excerpts used are from C. I. Gulian et al., eds., *Antologia gândirii românești, sec. XV–XIX* (Bucharest: Ed. Politică, 1967), vol. I, pp. 380–383.

About the author

Simion Bărnuțiu [1808, Bocșa Română (*Hun.* Boksánbánya, *Ger.* Rumänisch Bokschan, Transylvania) – 1864, Trăzneu (*Hun.* Ördökgút, *Ger.* Teufelsbrunnen, Transylvania)]: professor of law and philosopher. His family was of modest origins. Bărnuțiu began his primary education in his home village and between 1818 and 1820 he completed his secondary education in Șimleu (*Hun.* Szilágysomlyó) and Carei (*Hun.* Nagykároly, *Ger.* Grosskarol). From 1826 to 1829, he studied theology at the Greek-Catholic Seminar in Blaj (*Hun.* Balázsfalva, *Ger.* Blasendorf), where he was appointed professor of history and philosophy in 1839. As a result of his nationalist activity and a conflict with Bishop Ioan Lemeny (1780–1861), he was later dismissed. In the decade before the revolution of 1848, Bărnuțiu became involved in public life in Transylvania and published articles in various newspapers. Two major themes preoccupied him intensely: the role of religion and national rights. The latter theme was reflected in his criticism of the intention of Hungarian liberals to introduce Hungarian as the language of public administration and of education throughout Transylvania. In 1842 the Transylvanian diet enacted a law that mandated the use of Hungarian in Romanian Greek Catholic and Orthodox schools. Bărnuțiu defended the use of the Romanian language, condemning the law as an attempt not merely to deprive the Romanians of their language but also to destroy their national being. Although the language law was not implemented, Bărnuțiu developed increasing reservations towards Hungarian liberalism. During the Revolution of 1848, Bărnuțiu was one of most active Romanian leaders. He wrote one of the revolutionary proclamations, which advocated recognition of the Romanian nation as equal to the Hungarian and Saxon nations. He was also the vice-president of the National Assembly of Romanians in Transylvania. On 15 May 1848 he delivered a memorable speech to the Romanian revolutionaries gathered in Blaj, in which he outlined the main demands of the Romanian national movement in Transylvania. After the defeat of the revolu-

tion he escaped to Oltenia and then to Vienna. After 1849 Bărnăuțiu continued his studies in Vienna and Pavia, where he obtained a doctorate in law. In 1855 he was invited to teach in a lycée in Iași, and later became professor of law at the University of Iași. Bărnăuțiu was known for his excessive Latinist convictions which eventually determined **Titu Maiorescu** (1840–1917) to launch a devastating critique of his theories. In Transylvania, on the other hand, he was regarded as a symbol of the Revolution of 1848, and became a constant point of reference for Romanian nationalism in Austria-Hungary.

Main works: *Raporturile românilor cu ungurii și principiile libertății naționale* (The relationship between Romanians and Hungarians, and the principles of national liberty) (1852); *Dreptul public al românilor* (The public law of the Romanians) (1867); *Dreptul natural privat* (Private natural law) (1868); *Psicologia empirică* (Empirical psychology) (1870).

Context

The revolution of 1848 in Hungary and Transylvania was a test for both Hungarian and Romanian nationalisms. When the Hungarian Diet opened in March 1848, **Lajos Kossuth** (1802–1894) demanded a new constitutional relationship between the Crown and the Diet. After the initial success of the revolution in Vienna and a series of demonstrations in Pest, Emperor Ferdinand (r. 1835–1848) could not oppose the Hungarian revolutionaries.

Having secured its autonomous power, the Hungarian Diet then passed the ‘April Laws.’ According to these laws, all males aged 20 years or over who met certain property requirements could vote in elections for the Lower Chamber; toleration was extended to all Christian denominations; peasant serfdom was abolished; taxation was extended to all inhabitants, noble or not; and patrimonial courts on estates were abolished. All citizens became subject to the same system of courts, with a right to trial by jury. Additionally, a national land bank for investment was established; freedom of the press and of instruction in schools was introduced; a National Guard was created as an autonomous Hungarian armed force; and, administrative union with Transylvania was declared, pending its ratification by the separate Transylvanian Diet, which consented in May 1848. The ‘April Laws’ reflected the national transformation advocated by Hungarian revolutionaries. Generally, the Romanian leaders in Transylvania welcomed the laws, but they rejected both the introduction of the Magyar language as compulsory criterion for being a candidate at the elections and the unification of Transylvania with Hungary.

The leadership of the Romanian national movement was divided between clerics and laic intellectuals. The first group was represented by Andrei Șa-

guna (1809–1873), bishop and metropolitan of the Romanian Orthodox Church in Transylvania; the second by Simion Bărnuțiu. In principle they agreed on the same demands; but while Șaguna was a moderate who tried to reconcile the issue of the protection of the Orthodox Church and the Romanian nation with loyalty to the Court of Vienna, Bărnuțiu was more interested in obtaining political autonomy for the Romanians within an autonomous Principality of Transylvania. The two leaders joined forces during the main assembly of the Romanian revolutionaries in Transylvania which took place in Blaj in May 1848. The union of Transylvania with Hungary was openly rejected, and Bărnuțiu expressed his revolutionary program and nationalist ideas in the speech he delivered on that occasion.

Bărnuțiu's theory of the nation combined the Romantic ethos of the period with the rationalism of the Enlightenment. He attempted to combine his interest in philosophy with an increasing preoccupation with the national language and historical tradition. Thus, his definition of the nation differed from that of his predecessors in the eighteenth century in one significant aspect. National rights, he claimed, should not be based upon historical precedents and imperial diplomas but should be derived from the theory of natural law and the idea of inalienable human rights. Deeply influenced by the philosophy of Immanuel Kant, especially in the popularized version offered by Wilhelm Krug (translated into Romanian in the 1830s), Bărnuțiu regarded the transformation of society professed by philosophers of the Enlightenment and the development of national consciousness advocated by Romantic thinkers as intricately connected. According to him, philosophy was as much about deciphering the universal laws of existence as about legitimating freedom and the right to existence. Philosophy determined the individual to live an intellectual and moral life, while nationalism imparted to him a sense of belonging to a community. Nations, as aggregates of individuals, possessed natural rights and deserved equal treatment and recognition.

Bărnuțiu's philosophical rationalism also shaped his attitude towards religion. Before the Revolution of 1848, Romanian clerics in Transylvania were the uncontested champions of the national idea. Religious rights were indistinguishable from national rights. The group of secular intellectuals that emerged during the 1840s argued for a broader definition of the nation which diminished the role of religion in shaping the identity of the individual. Eventually, these secular intellectuals seized the leadership of the national movement from the religious leaders. Bărnuțiu acknowledged the indispensable role that Romanian Greek Catholic and Orthodox churches had played in the past in defending the Romanian nation, but he accused them of threatening

national unity, as both churches were preoccupied more with their religious interests than with the general welfare of the nation. One solution, Bărnăuțiu suggested, was to limit the authority of the church with respect to national issues. As the majority of Romanian schools in Transylvania were under church jurisdiction, Bărnăuțiu demanded the modernization of the school curriculum so as to include the study of the sciences and modern languages in addition to religious subjects. The 'revival' of the nation, he concluded, should be based not on religious dogmatism but on the education of the masses, along with the introduction of social and political liberties.

Bărnăuțiu's criticism of religion did not prevent him from admiring the writings of the 'Transylvanian School,' and especially their ideas about the Roman origins of the Romanians. Like his predecessors, Samuil Micu, **Petru Maior** and Gheorghe Șincai, Bărnăuțiu identified a connection between the Latin language and modern Romanian. Bărnăuțiu did not, however, concentrate only on the linguistic aspect of the Latin connection. He constructed a theory of the nation that was based on ancient Roman law. He used the model of the Roman republic to advocate the creation of a 'Romanian republic' that would unite all Romanians and which would be governed by laws established by the community. The power of the 'Romanian republic' thus envisioned by Bărnăuțiu was based on the nature of the Romanian people, its intellectual and moral qualities, and its material power. From the Romans who possessed '*maiestas*' ('majesty'), the Romanians had acquired '*maiestate*,' which was, according to Bărnăuțiu, the supreme quality of the Romanian nation. Although Romanians were the direct continuators of Roman customs, they had developed a very particular legal tradition, different than the one existing in Western Europe. Thus, European constitutions—whose genesis Bărnăuțiu traced to the medieval period—were not appropriate for Romanians. European constitutionalism was, to Bărnăuțiu, just a fiction. What the Romanians needed was liberty, justice and the right to property.

Bărnăuțiu's endorsement of the rationalism of the Enlightenment—in a period when the Romantic '*Weltanschauung*' dominated European thinking—led some scholars to contest the existence of Romanticism among Transylvanian Romanians. Bărnăuțiu's philosophical system was indeed derived from Kant's rationalism, but his definition of the nation was influenced rather by Romanticism. Bărnăuțiu enjoyed a great reputation at the time. Although his exaggerations about the 'Latin' character of the Romanian nation were soon rejected, interest in his legal theory of the nation survived until the early twentieth century. In *Viața și ideile lui Simion Bărnăuțiu* (The life and ideas of Simion Bărnăuțiu) (1924), Gheorghe Bogdan-Duică coupled Bărnăuțiu's juridi-

cal ideas about the nation with discussing Transylvanian regionalism, which animated certain Romanian intellectuals from Transylvania in the interwar period.

MT

The public law of the Romanians

Romanian law and Roman law

Romanian law is Roman law, which is why it is imperative that it be constantly in accordance with the natural and eternal principles of law that the Roman people established and approved; such development requires the very existence of a Romanian nation, for the right of nations that are alive is not born casually, nor is it borrowed from foreigners, but it is born from the indigenous nature, like language; therefore, as it would be unnatural, irrational and non-national to corrupt one's language through the use of foreign languages, the same applies to law. In the continuous evolution of our law based on ancient foundations, we will show the vital and regenerating power of our nation, and its decadence through the adoption of foreign codes of law.

The Romanian nation

Nation, race, or people (natio, gens, populus), as Cicero said, are not any crowd of people united in any way, but a crowd of people united by natural links such as the same origin and the same language (*vocum communio*), and then by the consensus of law and the communion of interests.

Each nation is individual, and all national rights are united in the personality of the nation; it might be said that they belong to the country, if the country is understood to belong to the nation; and if the country is of the crown, and the crown is of a hereditary family, then the true issue of national rights arises, and these will still be of the family who owns the crown, the country and the nation. It has never been so necessary to reveal that the nation is the subject of public right as now, when powerful nations are at war against poor ones, and the privileged classes wage war upon those who suffer under the burden of catering for these privileges. Now it should be known to the Romanians, too, that the public rights of the Romanians are a common possession of all Romanians, not the private property of some, as things have

started to happen with the Romanians, too, after the theory of Haller¹ and the European reaction; it should be known that the territory that the Romanians inhabit as owners belongs to the Romanian nation, [and] not the nation to the territory [...]

The objective of the Romanian Republic

The objective of the Romanian Republic is included in the very idea of it as *coetus multitudinis juris consensu et communione utilitatis sociatus*,² that is, law and justice should dominate and govern all over, so that the Romanian nation can live in eternal liberty and independently under their shield, to be able to develop and defend its physical and spiritual life, and enjoy common peace and prosperity. [...]

The features of the Romanian Republic

Among the features of the Romanian Republic we include:

The nature of the Romanian people: with the Romanian people, we have verified the saying of Sallust, namely that nature is stronger than law. Goths, Huns, Avars, Greeks, Bulgarians tried to conquer it; then came the Hungarians, and the Germans with new and amended plans to break away the connections within the nation, and to wipe it out. They divided it, crushed it, and fooled it with imaginary happiness which allegedly would descend on it from foreign civilizations. How many times its intelligent sons left it, and yet it has held out despite all, and its power shows in its language, unity and concord.

Politics orders and determines intellectual and moral powers, and talents; then [it determines] those educational institutions destined to these evolutions so as to help the good nature of the Romanian people, and to strengthen it with real national powers. [Politics] can also endanger the Romanian people;

¹ Karl Ludwig von Haller (1768–1854), Swiss professor of constitutional law of conservative political orientation. He was a grandson of the famous poet Albrecht von Haller. Haller's most important work was his *Die Restauration der Staatswirtschaft oder Theorie des natürlich-geselligen Zustands, der Chimäre des künstlich-bürgerlichen entgegengesetzt*.

² "Gathering of a multitude allied by the sanction of law, with a community of benefit" (Cicero, *De republica* I, 25).

this would happen especially if the intelligentsia that governs and leads [the nation] had more trust in all that is foreign than in what is Romanian.

The nature of the Romanian people, the evolution of its intellectual and moral powers and of its talents, the erection of educational institutions, the accomplishment of national goals also require material resources, natural products, services, natural provisions, supplies and money; the Republic cannot exist without a national pecuniary wealth. Here, however, Romanian politics can exercise national power, it can support agriculture, emancipating it from the serfdom that presses it, emancipate its industry and commerce from foreign domination, thus helping the creation of national and public wealth; but it can also carry on an anti-Romanian policy, perpetuating the serfdom of Romanian peasants, bringing foreign products, abandoning industry and agriculture to foreigners, and therefore destroying national prosperity. [...]

The sovereignty of the Romanian People

The sovereignty of the Romanian people is the supreme value, which applies to all its territory, individuals, goals, and national affairs. This unique, indivisible, sacred and totally independent sovereignty, not subject to any other sovereignty on earth, is the condition of a true human and national life, without which none of the most sacred goals could be achieved, which is why the Romans called it 'majesty' (*maiestas*)—its name also shows its imposing importance. Sovereignty characterizes all free peoples (it characterizes the Romanians, too) when the people have their laws, and magistrates through whom they govern themselves. [...]

The constitutions of Europe are not for the Romanians

Because these constitutions are the creations of feudalism which we see in the House of Lords in England, in the Chamber of Peers in France, even in the Senate House in Belgium, and in the customary assemblies of the Romanian Principalities and so on. [These constitutions] are based on the idea of the hereditary principle—an idea which is foreign to both the old Romans and the Romanians in Dacia—which is *per excellentiam* German and destined not only to preserve the domination of the Germans over the Romans, but also (*si fata velint*) to spread it all over the world; [through these constitutions] German princes dominate other European races, [causing] division and

annexation of other nations, imposing on them German principles through universal suffrage and constitutions—all to the benefit of the Germans.

None of these constitutions answered the wish of the nation, or the postulates of the human mind and life. By dividing the sovereignty and giving some of it to princes as properties, [these constitutions] made them feudal lords over the people, who feared for their liberty more than they feared foreigners, and they fought against them and their ministers more than they fought against foreigners. European constitutionalism is a political fiction invented with the aim of making peoples forget their liberty, by making them believe that they are free.

Translated by Mária Kovács

DORA D'ISTRIA: THE ALBANIAN NATIONALITY ON THE BASIS OF POPULAR SONGS

Title: *La nationalité albanaise d'après les songs populaires* (The Albanian nationality on the basis of popular songs)

Originally published: *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Paris, 15 May 1866, pp. 382–418.

Language: French.

Excerpts used are from pp. 383, 384–385, 387–388, 391–392.

About the author

Dora D'Istria (literary pseudonym of Elena Ghica) [1829, Bucharest – 1888, Florence]: writer, ethnographer, historian. Dora D'Istria was the niece of Prince Grigore IV Ghica (*Gr. Ghika, Alb. Gjika*), the first native ruler of Wallachia (1822–1828) following a century of Phanariot rule. She was also the niece of Prince Alexandru Ghica, ruler of Wallachia (1834–1842), and a great niece of Prince Grigore III Ghica, who was beheaded in 1777 by the Ottomans for opposing the occupation of Bukovina. Her father, Mihail Ghica, served as a high official (*mare vornic*) from 1835 to 1842. Although in one of her texts D'Istria states that her family came from the coast of southern Albania, the Ghica family emigrated probably from Korça (*Gr. Korytsa*) in the seventeenth century and soon became one of the most important families in Wallachia and Moldavia. The Ghica princes played a leading role in political and economic developments in Wallachia and Moldavia and later on in the new state of Romania. Highly educated and knowledgeable, young Elena soon became known in the aristocratic circles of Bucharest. After her marriage to the Russian Count Alexander Kosoltsov-Massalsky, she moved to St. Petersburg, where she spent seven years. After separating from her husband and his death in 1871, she lived in Geneva, Livorno, Venice, and finally in Florence. She wrote a series of books, articles and studies which were published in leading journals and scientific revues like the *Revue des Deux Mondes* in Paris, the *Diretto* in Turin, the *Spectateur de l'Orient* in Athens, and the *Revue Internationale* in Vienna. In these writings she elaborated on the ethnography and the social conditions of the Albanians, Greeks, Romanians and South-Slavs in the nineteenth century. D'Istria's writings enjoyed great popularity in Albanian patriotic circles. In 1870 Dhimitër Kamarda (*It. Demetrio Camarda*) prepared an anthology of Albanian poetry dedicated to her. Moreover, D'Istria became a symbol of Albanian-Romanian solidarity to the Albanian emigrant circles in Bucharest, who were very active in defending Albanian interests

during the Eastern Crisis. The historiography of the communist period emphasized D'Istria's Albanian origin and her efforts in support of the Albanian movement. In addition, her name came to be used as a symbol of the friendship between the Albanians and the Romanians.

Main works: *La vie monastique dans l'église orientale* (1855); *La nationalité roumaine d'après les songs populaires* (1859); *Les Femmes en Orient* (1863); *La nationalité serbe d'après les songs populaires* (1865); *La nationalité albanaise d'après les songs populaires. Les albanais des deux côtés de l'Adriatique* (1866); *La nationalité hellénique d'après les chant populaires* (1867); *Le golfe de la Spetzia* (1867); *Les écrivains albanais de l'Italie meridionale* (1867); *La nationalité bulgare d'après les songs populaires* (1868); *La poésie populaire des Turcs orientaux* (1873); Second edition of this book: *La poésie des Ottomans* (1877); *Gli Albanesi in Rumania* (The Albanians in Romania) (1873).

Context

Towards the end of eighteenth century, under the influence of the ideas of German romanticism, the attention of scholars and teachers throughout Southeast Europe was directed towards the heritage of folklore. One of the most famous collectors and scholars at that time was the Serbian **Vuk Karadžić**, whose work inspired many others.

In the Albanian case, a crucial role was played by the Albanian diaspora in south Italy and Sicily. After the death of Skanderbeg (*Alb.* Gjergj Kastrioti Skënderbeu) in 1468, many members of the Catholic Albanian nobility, followed by large parts of the population, fled from the Albanian-inhabited lands, mainly to southern Italy. Similarly, the Orthodox Albanian population of the Morea (today the Peloponnese), fearing abusive treatment at the hands of the Ottomans, left their lands and moved to Sicily. They all bore the old name of *Arbëresh*—as the Albanians called themselves in the Middle Ages—and are referred to as such in Albanian historiography. There, particularly in Calabria and Sicily, several clergymen played a crucial role during the following centuries particularly in regard to Albanian culture and linguistics, to mention only Lekë Matranga (*It.* Alessandro Matranga) or Jul Variboda (*It.* Giulio Variboda). From the beginning of the nineteenth century, following the Italian example, they also started to promote a political agenda. Indeed, it was Albanian literati from this community who first introduced romantic ideas among the Albanians in the Balkans.

In 1866 Jeronim De Rada (*It.* Geronimo De Rada), one of the leading poets of the Albanian national movement, in line with the romantic interest in national epic poetry, published in Naples the *Rapsodie di un poema albanese* (Rhapsodies from an Albanian poem). It was a collection of popular songs,

which, according to the author's claims, formed a part of an old Albanian epic cycle similar to Homer's *Iliad*. However, as they were popular songs collected by the author in his native village and the surrounding region, this anthology can hardly be classified as such. Moreover, De Rada altered the original texts, introducing material written by himself. Nevertheless, D'Istria took this collection as a base to ponder the origin, present situation and future of the Albanian nation.

In the mid 1860s an essential issue for Albanian activists was the recognition of the existence of the Albanian nation and its language as different from that of the Ottomans, the Greeks or the Slavs. In this context, Dora D'Istria's text was of crucial importance. In a series of ethnographic essays she analyzed popular poetry, presenting it as the historic and cultural heritage of the nations of Southeast Europe. In the work dedicated to Albanian folklore she presented a number of assertions, which later on became the programmatic claims of Albanian nationalism. She claimed that Albanians are descended, together with the Greeks, from Pelasgic tribes (mentioned by Herodotus), and so constitute the most ancient nations in the Balkans. This postulate became fundamental to the ideology of the Albanian 'Revival,' and was used even in twentieth-century debates as an argument against Serbian claims on Kosova (Kosovo).

D'Istria described Albanians with affection as a brave and ancient nation. Analyzing the texts of popular songs, she described their way of life, customs and traditions, illustrating her arguments with examples from early and modern history. In addition, D'Istria was the first to underline the inferior position of women in Albanian society, within both the Muslim and the Christian populations. Presenting the grave situation in Albania, she argued that only through an educational and cultural movement would Albanians succeed in achieving liberty and creating a modern society.

RH

The Albanian nationality on the basis of popular songs

[...] Albania's past as it is transmitted to us in popular songs is therefore more relevant than might be thought to present-day questions, and in any case it is always interesting to see the lower classes encountering the challenges of invasion and exile without losing anything of the qualities which give strength to a sense of national identity. [...]

Philologists have long debated the thorny question as to which language Albanian popular songs were composed in. Several, including Poqueville¹ insisted in looking for the origin of Chkipetars² in Caucasian Albania. Leibniz imagined that the language of the Albanians must have been that of the ancient Celts. Albanian-Italians, like Monsignor Crispi, Bishop of Lampsaco,³ and Angelo Masci, refuted these hypotheses in well-founded works, but they were not sufficiently up-to-date with the admirable philological discoveries in Germany to avoid regrettable errors of detail in their proofs. It was left to Mr. G. Hahn,⁴ the learned author of *Albanian Studies*, to cast new light on this question, and to a Sicilian Albanian, Father Camarda, to clarify it definitively.

For Mr. Hahn the Albanians are descendants of the famous Pelasgi. The Pelasgi would have formed the pre-historical population of Epirus, Macedonia, Illyria, Greece, the Peloponnese and large Italian territories. In Greece, the Pelasgi would have adopted the Hellenic language, when the Hellenic population came to dominate the Pelasgic one, while the native language would have lasted until both the Bulgarian invasion of Macedonia and the Serbian invasion of Illyria. In Albania, southern Illyria and Epirus, the Pelasgic population resisted assimilation by the Slavic population. Since the fourteenth century the Epirus colonies of modern Greece have sprung from these too little studied countries. Hence there was a reverse re-run of the invasion of the first ages, with the difference that the native Pelasgi had mixed with invading Hellenes and that nowadays the new Pelasgi established in Greece are becoming more and more Hellenic. According to the author of *Albanian Studies*, there would now be Albanians in all the Hellenic provinces, be they in continental Greece, or the Peloponnesian peninsula, with the exception of Aetolia, Akarnia, Lakonia and Messene. In Attica, Megarid, Argolid and Boeotia, they made up the vast majority of the population. Finally, the islands of Hydra, Spetses, Poros and Salamis, southern Euboeia and the northern part of the island of Andros would be inhabited entirely by Albanians. Moreover, if Mr. Hahn thinks that the ancient Pelasgi and Hellenes were different peoples, he insists on showing numerous ties of kinship which link them: "The

¹ Francois Charles Hugues Laurent de Pouqueville (1770–1839), French consul at Ali Pasha's court in Jannina from 1809 till 1811.

² From *Shqiptar*, which is the term used for 'Albanian' in Albanian.

³ Giuseppe Crispi (1781–1859), Bishop of Lampsaco, a prominent linguist and classical philologist and a major figure of the Albanian community in Sicilia.

⁴ Johann Georg von Hahn (1811–1869), Austrian consul in Jannina in the 1850s, considered to be one of the founding fathers of modern Albanian studies.

proto-Albanian is not only a contemporary of the proto-Roman and Greek, but there is an affinity between them, or, in other words, what the three peoples share in terms of their customs comes from a common component, the Pelasgic component.” Theodor Mommsen views “the common origin” of the Albanian, Hellenic and Italian races as an incontrovertible fact. [...]

The struggles of the Eastern Empire against the Slavs did not improve the situation of the Albanians. However, the Pelasgic nation, which had survived so many invasions, was not bound to disappear faced with the Serbian population. Part of Albania went so far as to embrace Catholicism so as to establish Albanian nationality in the face of Serbian nationality. The Turks had barely entered Europe when they tried in turn to conquer small and brave Albania. They were resisted for a long time: by the Balsa family—who, according to the tradition, were descendants of the Baux family from Southern France—as well as by the Topia and Castrioti families all of whom successively personified the various phases of this struggle. It was the Castrioti family which had the glory of producing the great Skanderbeg, the hero whose exploits almost drove out the Turks forever and who founded a veritable national dynasty in Albania.

George Castriote, to whom the Turkish name of the Great Macedonian⁵ is normally applied, was a far worthier inspiration for popular poetry than the Serbian hero, Marko Kraliévitich.⁶ Unlike Marko, he is not an idealized hero of the popular imagination; he is still more admirable in historical terms than in the people’s songs, he did not need the myths with which Albanian bards embellished his legend to establish his greatness. [...]

The double love of independence and war, which springs from every line of these songs, offers an explanation of all of the history of these peoples from their defeat by Turkey and their enslavement to the Asiatic race. Within the [Ottoman] Empire they are warlike vassals who have no other preoccupation than that of shaking the Ottoman dominance and who often put the em-

⁵ D’Istria is referring to Alexander the Great. The Ottomans called Gjergj Kastrioti *Skander*, which is the Albanian version of *Iskender*, the Ottoman Turkish form of Alexander. The obvious connotation was that Kastrioti was as brave as Alexander the Great.

⁶ D’Istria is referring to the hero of Serbian, Bosnian, Croatian, Bulgarian, Macedonian and Albanian oral epic poetry, Kraljević Marko. The real Marko Kraljević (1335–1395), son of king Vukašin Mrnjavčević, who died in 1371 during the battle of Maritsa (*Gr.* Evros, *Tur.* Meriç) River, had ruled over the territory of today’s Republic of Macedonia, with Prilep as its capital. He was an Ottoman vassal and died in the Battle of Rovine in 1395.

pire of their masters on the brink of defeat; but if shown the struggle to be undertaken, the power to be overcome, even against men of the Pelasgic race, they are ready, they launch themselves and become the strongest defense of the authorities of the Porte. An Albanian, Mustapha, fought against Marco Botzaris;⁷ an Albanian, Ali Pasha reached the boundaries of the Souliots.⁸ The gratitude owed to them by Turkey should not be exaggerated, however. Its whole internal history is, so to speak, the history of the attempts of these dangerous auxiliaries to reverse the authority of the sultans. It is remarkable when they are content, like Mahmud in Shkodra,⁹ Ali pasha in Jannina, to form more or less independent pashaliks in their own country, for they also attack the crown. Rejeb aga, the leader of an Albanian contingent sent to Egypt, rose up in Cairo and died heroically in battle, thereby serving as an example and paving the way for Muhammad Ali. The latter, who was the son of an Albanian aga, became the viceroy of Egypt, and, without [the opposition of] an European coalition, which France refused to join, he could have put in danger the crown of the sultans.

These traditions have a profound influence on the mentality of Albanian populations. Popular poetry relates the names and deeds of heroes who covered themselves with glory in the war against the Turks.

Translated by Hugh Roberts

⁷ In Albanian Marko Boçari (1788–1823). Member of a prominent Souliot Orthodox family. Exiled from his native Epirus in 1803, he joined Ali Pasha in 1820 and later he took part in the Greek War of Independence. He died in the battle of Karpenisi.

⁸ The inhabitants of Souli, a remote mountainous region, free from any Ottoman control, in southern Epirus. The Souliots were Albanian by origin and Orthodox by faith. Their insolent character constituted a threat both for the Ottoman authorities and for Ali Pasha of Tepelen, who, after successive campaigns, eventually managed to eradicate them in 1802.

⁹ *Srb.* Skadar; *It.* Scutari.

**OSMAN HAMDİ BEY
AND VICTOR MARIE DE LAUNAY:
THE POPULAR COSTUMES
OF TURKEY IN 1873**

Title: *Les costumes populaires de la Turquie en 1873/Elbise-i 'Osmaniyye*
(The popular costumes of Turkey in 1873)

Originally published: Istanbul, The Levant Times and Shipping Gazette
Press, 1873

Language: Text in French; captions of photographic plates in Ottoman Turkish
A Turkish translation has been published with the title *1873 Senesinde
Türkiye'de Yerel Kıyafetler*, translated by Erol Üyepazarcı (Istanbul: Sa-
bancı Üniversitesi, 1999). The excerpts used are from the original edition
of 1873, pp. 7–9 and 17–18.

About the authors

Osman Hamdi Bey [1842, Istanbul – 1910, Istanbul): Ottoman official and painter. In his youth, Osman Hamdi was sent to Paris by his father (İbrahim Edhem Paşa, a prominent member of the *Tanzimat* elite) to study law, where, instead, he attended classes on art and archaeology in the *Ecole des Beaux-Arts* until his return home in 1871. Although Hamdi Bey was not a registered student of the *Ecole*, it is generally assumed that he had worked in the ateliers of the eminent Orientalists Jean-Léon Gérôme and Gustave Boulanger. Osman Hamdi became one of the most active figures of Ottoman cultural life after returning to the imperial capital. From 1881 to 1910 he served as the director of the Imperial Museum of Antiquities. During his term, he directed several archaeological excavations within the imperial territories and initiated official regulations and laws that were aimed at stopping the pillaging of historical ruins by European dealers and archaeologists. Later, Osman Hamdi played a major role in the establishment of the Imperial School of Fine Arts (1882) where he taught painting until his death. In the footsteps of his masters, Osman Hamdi Bey produced paintings in the Orientalist manner throughout his artistic career. But in contrast to the majority of European artists, for whom the ideological constructs about the East existed as an uncritically accepted discursive substructure, the Ottoman artist manipulated the Orientalist genre as an instrument to deliver a clear alternative message that was informed by a larger cultural and ideological agenda. Osman Hamdi employed and appropriated European techniques of representation in order to construct what he held to be “objective” scenes of a putatively native and pristine Ottoman/Islamic past, albeit with a highly picturesque and self-exoticizing technique of representation. Marie de Launay and Osman Hamdi Bey were among the most vocal and productive on the Ottoman intellectual scene striving to assess, salvage and promote the traditional arts.

Main works: *Le Tumulus de Nemroud Dag* (co-authored with [Yervant] Osgan Efendi, 1883); *Les Ruines d'Aslan-Tasch* (1889); *Une Necropole royale à Sidon: Fouilles de Hamdi Bey* (co-authored with Salomon T. Reinach, 1892).

Victor Marie de Launay [1822 or 1823, Paris – ?, Istanbul]: Artist and amateur historian, an Ottoman official of French origin. According to the official Ottoman biographical records, Marie de Launay received most of his education at home, under the supervision of his father, César Marie de Launay, who was an official connected to the palace. The records indicate that de Launay also benefited from the tutorship of a certain Léon Gautier (most probably the eminent philologist and member of the *Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*), whose views on medieval history and folk traditions must have left an indelible mark on de Launay. Throughout his versatile career in the Ottoman Empire, he displayed a similarly romantic enthusiasm for Early Ottoman/Late Medieval history and for local customs and popular lore. Marie de Launay arrived in Istanbul around the time of the Crimean War, and in 1857 became the assistant engineer, archivist and draughtsman of the newly established Pera Municipality (the Sixth Municipal District) in Istanbul, which was the model area for instituting modern municipal reforms at the time. By virtue of his scholarly interest in architecture, art and traditional crafts, Marie de Launay became deeply involved in the representation of the Ottoman Empire in world expositions throughout his official career. He contributed to the Ottoman exhibits not only as an organizer and an author, but also as an exhibitor—an amateur artist and collector who displayed his own paintings (mostly scenes about medieval history), illustrations of Ottoman types and costumes, and collections of handcrafted objects on various national and international occasions. Through his official role he had a chance to be involved in many substantial publications related to the expositions. For the 1867 Paris Exposition, for instance, he authored the voluminous catalogue of the Ottoman exhibits, *La Turquie à l'exposition universelle de 1867* (Paris, 1867), generally attributed to the director of the Ottoman commission, Salaheddin Bey. Marie de Launay was co-author of the earliest scholarly study on the history and theory of Ottoman architecture, the *Usul-i Mi'mari-i 'Osmani/ L'Architecture ottomane* (Istanbul, 1873), produced on the occasion of the 1873 world exposition in Vienna. The records do not provide the date of Marie de Launay's death but indicate that he retired from his official post in 1890.

Main works: *Coup l'oeil général sur l'exposition nationale à Constantinople – Extraits du "Journal de Constantinople"* (Istanbul, 1863); with Montani Efendi, *Usul-i Mi'mari-i 'Osmani / L'Architecture ottomane* (Istanbul, 1873); and, with the palace chemist Bonkowsky Bey, *Brusa ve Civarı* [Bursa and environs] (Istanbul, 1880).

Context

The *Elbise-i 'Osmaniyye/Les Costumes populaires de la Turquie* is a photographic album of traditional Ottoman dress commissioned by the Ottoman government on the occasion of the 1873 World Exposition in Vienna. The *Elbise* comprises seventy-four photographic plates, each featuring a group of

live models displaying regional outfits. The plates are organized under three main sections (the European Territories, the Aegean/Mediterranean Islands and the Asian/African Territories) that are subdivided into twenty two units according to the provincial divisions of the empire. Each plate (carrying explanatory headings in Ottoman Turkish) is supplemented by texts written in French, providing detailed comments about the sartorial traditions of the particular groups depicted as well as basic information on the history, geography and customs of the area under scrutiny. The whole project was undertaken jointly by Osman Hamdi Bey, the eminent painter who acted as the commissary of the Ottoman exhibits in 1873, and Victor Marie de Launay. In the Vienna Exposition the *Elbise* was displayed along with a large collection of Ottoman costumes, exhibited in the main gallery of the Ottoman section, consisting of mannequins wearing the popular costumes documented in the *Elbise*. As the French title of the volume suggests, with the *Elbise* collection Hamdi Bey and Marie de Launay sought to portray the ordinary Ottoman subject from a detached ethnographic viewpoint. Categorically dismissing images of the Westernized urban elite, they chose to focus exclusively on the Ottoman commoner who largely maintained the traditional tastes and lifestyle of the pre-*Tanzimat* era. Their vision was that an exhaustive and analytical documentation of popular dress would not only present a realistic and consummate picture of the diverse Ottoman polity to local and international viewers, but would also surpass and correct orientalist generalizations and inaccuracies that were ingrained in common European perceptions of the Ottoman Empire.

In the introduction of the *Elbise* Hamdi Bey and de Launay make a clear distinction between two types of clothing: “garment” (*vêtement*) and “costume.” The former stands for the modern (European) manner of dressing which, the authors claim, is perpetually inflicted by the “caprices of fashion,” while the latter represents the unwavering, local traditions in dress which are “perfectly adapted” to the peculiar conditions and proprieties of their use (the climate and geography involved, the social rank and profession of the wearer, and so on). It was the insight of the Ottoman authors that while modern garments effaced all signs of social and cultural difference in society, homogenizing the world with its “strict and cold uniformity,” local costumes “[imposed] lively sentiments of confraternity and solidarity ... and thus realized, on a national scale ... the rational definition of the good and the beautiful,” which the authors summarized under the rubric ‘Variety in unity.’

The way Ottoman subjects are represented in the *Elbise* corroborated the role attributed to costume as a crucial agent of social order and harmony. In

most photographs, people from various walks of life are brought together irrespective of their social standing or occupation in order to provide a comprehensive and amalgamated picture of the diverse imperial conglomerate. Interestingly, the very image of multi-ethnic unity conveyed by these syncretic tableaux was diametrically opposed to that defined and imposed by the early *Tanzimat* reformers, which entailed rigorous dress codes on the official level, promoting uniform Europeanized attire as the ubiquitous marker of a new and more homogenous Ottoman identity. The *Elbise*, then, with its celebration of local diversity in dress, is an accurate indicator of how the terms of participation within the reformulated Ottoman identity were altered during the Late *Tanzimat*. With a few decades of the reforms behind them, the Ottoman intellectuals were now keen to utilize the visual power of clothing in order to emphasize the expressed cultural differences (the abundant “variety”) of the Ottoman society which were happily and harmoniously subordinated to a supra-ethnic/religious sense of (imperial/national) unity. Appropriately, Europeanized attire is displayed in only one case in the *Elbise*. The first plate of the album features a young “bourgeois” gentleman from Istanbul donning the “black official dress” adopted by government employees and the Westernized upper classes (see excerpt below). The authors openly acknowledge the civic virtues of this outfit that makes an “efendi, bey or pasha” out of Greeks, Armenians and Levantines and recognize it as an agent that helps dispel age-old hatreds nurtured by some intolerant Muslims. Yet, they still find it regretful that the “noble, comfortable and healthy” alternatives offered by the traditional costume are stamped out by the constricting and ungainly standards of Westernizing fashion.

The *Elbise*, then, testifies to the ambiguities, contradictions and incurable optimism of the official Ottoman discourse, as it seeks to define the terms by which a modern and overarching *Tanzimat* identity can be reconciled with tradition and cultural diversity. But one also needs to remember that in its romantic-traditionalist view of Ottoman culture and society, the *Elbise* renders the products of ‘indigenous tradition’ favorable and attractive to the eyes of a modern European audience who displayed an immense aesthetic curiosity for anything that was ‘untarnished’ by the ills of modern industrialism. This compliance should not come as a surprise, though, since the Westernized Ottoman elite was equally obsessed with the sensual allure of ‘pure’ and ‘authentic’ tradition, and the aesthetic arsenal of Late *Tanzimat* traditionalism drew heavily on the sensibilities of European Orientalism.

The popular costumes of Turkey in 1873

Preface

We believe that it is important to call attention to the essential differences between traditional “costume” and “garment.” While both types of dress serve the same sartorial purpose, the latter [that is, the modern outfit] displays no particular or characteristic features appropriate to its use; always following the caprices of fashion, it is subject to endless change. Costume, on the other hand, is invariable in its overall features and its cut. It displays only slight modifications depending on the quality of the fabric chosen and the elegance of the supplementary adornments.

Day by day, modern garment grows to be a uniform for the entire world. Not only does the garment efface all distinctions between various classes of a society, it also obliterates the natural and moral barriers that were thought to separate nations in inviolable ways. In direct contrast, the traditional costume is perfectly adapted to the particular conditions, climatic requirements and customs of each land. As such, it stands as a notable area of interest and an inexhaustible source of information for ethnographical and social studies. [...] Considering all ranks of the social ladder, one would surely conclude that the costume surpasses the uniform garment in fully satisfying the diverse needs of the peasant, the workman from any trade, the modest bourgeois and the wealthy elite.

Upon viewing our collection of the popular costumes of Turkey, one realizes the unmistakable superiority of costume over garment. The spectacle reveals the perfect appropriateness of the costume of a *sakka* [water carrier], a *caïkdji* [boatman], a *hamal* [porter], a Bulgarian peasant, an Arab chief or a Syrian to the diverse conditions in which he lives, to the climate of his region, to the trade or profession he belongs, or to the position he occupies in society.

In this sense, we clearly recognize that the costume realizes the rational definition of the good and the beautiful, which can be epitomized by the words: *variety in unity*. Neither of these terms apply to garment, as during the short reign of each fashion there is no room for variety; fashion is strictly and coldly uniform. And then, exhausted after six months, the current fashion disappears; to be replaced by yet another one. Hence, the lack of a sense of unity in fashion.

Perhaps it is partly due to the influence of the garment, a completely modern creation, that European societies are faced with a new moral deformity,

unknown to this day, and for which a well chosen term is invented: the *déclassé*.

The influence of costume is in complete contrast to that of garment; it is indisputably beneficial. Costume maintains, in a natural sense, lively sentiments of solidarity, which can still be observed in Europe, for instance, in the special uniforms of some elite regiments or in the apparel of certain religious orders.

Similarly, the *esnaf* organizations [craft guilds] in Turkey deserve to be mentioned as regards the moralizing power of costume. Costume imposes a sense of shared responsibility, which engenders feelings of solid confraternity and professional integrity ... to all members of the guild.

It is also important not to dismiss the picturesque aspect of costume. It is certainly not a minor advantage, since for many the picturesque element constitutes the fundamental appeal of costume. [...]

We believe that ... the present study will be highly beneficial not only for artists, but, above all, for economists and researchers who work towards achieving the well-being of society. For the artists, this volume is a mine of precious materials; for fashion professionals, it is an interesting and instructive source of recreation; as for the philosopher and the savant, they will find numerous subjects for creative reflection and fruitful research. [...]

Description of the plate featuring a “bourgeois of Constantinople:”

[...] The “Europeanized” can be of all religions and nationalities of the Ottoman Empire, and from all classes of society. He sports the outfit rigorously adopted by the government officers. It is the ceremonial costume, the “black coat” of the progressives. It consists of the red *fez*, the black *setri* [Ottoman style frock-coat with no collar] and black trousers. But the excessively Europeanized type, very common among the rich classes, pushes things much further. ... In Constantinople, Smyrna and other large cities of the empire, one comes across “advanced” bourgeois types of exquisite taste who are not afraid to replace their *fez* with that marvel of elegance, the top-hat. At all times, they take care to carry a *fez* in their pockets, in case they need to present themselves to a *backward-minded* authority.

Still, we cannot deny the *benefits of civilization*. Everyone would agree that the black *setri*, the *fez* and the trousers, as well as the *bottines* [ankle-boots], render a great service: they help mollify the hatreds that often divided the diverse religions and nationalities of the empire; they help efface the

prominent differences that mark the non-Muslims in the eyes of the fanatics (that is, the spiteful Muslims), and allow Greeks, Armenians, Levantines and foreigners to be recognized as *effendis*, *beys* and *pashas*. Yet, while acknowledging all these benefits, we still regret the replacement of the picturesque costumes of the old days by the new garments.

Indeed, traditional costumes, the large *djubbé* [robe], the *chalwar* [baggy pants] in which the feet move at ease, the *salta* [short jacket] with free and comfortable arm-holes [...] the solid *yèmènis* [light shoes] of red and yellow color, the *kulah* [conical hat] and the *saryk* [turban], mortal enemies of the flu, in their simple, noble and comfortable ensemble, are indubitably more hygienic than the tight, ungraceful and ridiculous garment of the Europeanized moderns.

Translated by Ahmet Ersoy

STEFAN VERKOVICH: VEDA SLOVENA

Title: *Веда Словена* (Veda Slovena)

Originally published: *Веда Словена. Български народни песни от предисторична и предхристиянска доба. Открил в Тракия и Македония и издал Стефан Н. Веркович. Книга I.* [Bulgarian folk songs from pre-historical and Pre-Christian Age. Discovered in Thracia and Macedonia and edited by Stefan N. Verkovich. First book], Београд (Belgrade), 1874; *Веда Словенах. Обредни песни от языческо време. Упазени со устно предание при македонско-родопските българо-помаци. Книга друга.* [Ritual songs from the pagan age. Preserved in oral legends of the Macedonian-Rhodopian Bulgaro-Pomaks. Second book] С.-Петербург (Saint-Petersburg), 1881

Language: Bulgarian

The excerpt used is from *Веда Словена* (София: Отворено общество, 1997), pp. 13–20.

About the author

Stefan Verkovich [1821, Ugljara (Bosnia) – 1893, Sofia]: ethnologist and folklorist. He was born in Bosnia, where he was educated in a Catholic school, in Tolisa (1830–1833). He then entered the Franciscan monastery in Sutjeska, where in 1835 he was ordained as a monk. From 1837 he studied theology in Zagreb, where he was influenced by the Illyrian movement and became acquainted with its ideologist, the Croatian **Ljudevit Gaj**. He gave up his profession as monk in 1842 and left Zagreb in 1843, after the Illyrian movement was banned by the Austrian authorities. In 1848 he met **Ilija Garašanin** in Belgrade and informed him about the situation in Zagreb. In 1850 he refused a job in the state administration in Belgrade and moved to Serres, Macedonia, where he stayed for almost twenty years. In 1862 he agreed to become an agent of the Serbian government in Macedonia and fulfilled this function until 1876. During this period he sent regular reports to Belgrade under the pseudonym ‘Vlasich.’ After 1868 his sympathy with the local population led him to a progressive dissociation from the official position of Belgrade. He significantly contributed to the development of the literary language and the educational system in the region. After the Russian-Turkish war he moved to Russia, where he stayed until 1891. Thereafter he lived until his death in 1893 in Plovdiv and Sofia as a respected citizen of the newly created Bulgarian state, during which time he carried out ethnological expeditions in the region of the Rhodope mountains.

Main works: *Народне песме македонски бугара* [Folk songs of the Macedonian Bulgarians] (1860), *Древняя болгарская песня об Орфее* [An ancient Bulgarian song about Orpheus] (1867); *Веда Словена* [Veda Slovena] (1874–1881).

Context

Verkovich had a complex background: born in Bosnia, he received a Catholic education, but gradually he came to identify himself with the South-Slav and later with the Bulgarian ‘cause.’ From this point of view his development was similar to that of Jurij Venelin, who was Ruthenian by origin. The cases of Verkovich and Venelin can be perceived as symptomatic of the process of construction of the national consciousness in the period of Romanticism. Verkovich is also one of the main examples of the relationship of subordination between national and regional layers of identity.

Veda Slovena is a supposed South-Slav epos, a hoax similar to other pre-romantic and romantic texts which appeared all over Europe, starting with the ‘Songs of Ossian.’ Typologically and historically ‘Veda Slovena’ is even closer to Václav Hanka’s ‘*Rukopis Královédvorský*’ (Manuscript of the King’s Court)—a notorious forgery of the early-nineteenth century, translated into Bulgarian by Raiko Zhinzifov. It has been argued, however, that Verkovich’s hoax was not intentional, because Ivan Gologanov, a teacher who was working as Verkovich’s assistant, provided him with ‘ancient’ Slavic songs written in fact by Gologanov himself in accordance with the theories of Georgi Rakovski and taking as a model ancient Greek mythology. The text presents an epic tale in the traditional form of folk songs.

Verkovich’s cultural nationalism was, of course, in competition with Greek cultural nationalism, which was seen as the main danger to neighboring nations because of its intention to monopolize the Balkan and European cultural legacy. His position turned to a genuine Hellenophobia accompanied by pan-Slavist tendencies. Verkovich’s intention, paradoxical to some extent and finding explicit expression in the largely ideological Preface to the *Veda*, was to substitute ancient Slavic culture in place of Greek culture as a primordial bearer of the Spirit. More particularly, Verkovich rejected the philological hypothesis, according to which the proto-Slavic language was related to the Greek Doric dialect. On the contrary, the Doric dialect is considered from Verkovich’s point of view to derive from the ancient Slavic language and consequently ancient Greek culture is grounded in the ancient Slavic one. The Slavs are thus the ‘educators’ of the world, the most ancient and developed Indo-European culture. Commonality between Slavs and Greeks is due

only to the influence the former exercised on the latter, without any genealogical proximity.

As far as the epic is concerned, this thesis implies the influence of Slavic epic on Homer's work. Therefore, Verkovich's task was to (re)construct this most ancient epos in the form of a written corpus. His implicit hypothesis regarding the non-existence of such a corpus is that for the Slavic people this epos represents an organic part of their culture, still existing in an oral form. The main orientation of Verkovich's claims is typologically close to Georgi Sava Rakovski's, one of the most influential figures on the political and cultural scene in the 1850s and 1860s, and author of (para-)scientific arguments (in the form of etymologies, for instance) to support his theses on Bulgarian ethnic origins. His ultimate goal was to prove that Bulgarian culture and language were among the oldest manifestations of human culture, resting at its very foundations.

The first volume of *Veda Slovena* provoked a great debate in European Slavistics, involving some of its leading figures, such as Auguste Dozon, Louis Léger, and Josef Jireček. Several expeditions were sent to Macedonia and to the Rhodopes to collect similar epic materials. The most influential article which summarized the results of previous investigations and argued against the authenticity of the poem was published in 1903 in the most important forum of Slavic studies, the *Archiv für Slavistische Philologie*, by a leading Bulgarian philologist and literary historian, Ivan Shishmanov, who at that time occupied the position of Minister of Education. His influential Czech confrere Konstantin Jireček, the author of a 'History of the Bulgarians' and former Minister of Education of Bulgaria himself, expressed his support for Shishmanov's thesis. Another influential figure in Bulgarian scholarship, the academician Mikhail Arnaudov, repeated the same conclusion in his study 'Verkovich and the Veda Slovena' (1968). Nevertheless, a new interest in the contested work appeared in the 1980s, in line with the "national communist" turn in cultural politics.

BM

Preface to "Veda Slovena"

There are few peoples of the human race whose ancient history is as unknown as that of the Slavs! Not only is there no trace left of the slightest memory of the initial location they originated from—contrary to the case of other self-aware nations, the Jews, for example, who, since times unknown

and up to the present, through every misfortune and calamity in the world, have preserved the customs and traditions of their forefathers, as well as their entire folklore, cherishing and keeping these like sacred relics, and bequeathing them from one generation to the other with the same loyalty and purity with which they were inherited from their fathers—, but we also do not have any idea about the poetry left from Slavic antiquity up to the end of their pagan period, in a more pleasing form, since almost nothing from it, or from their production—be it mental or manual—has reached us, and so we are unable to judge their role in the world, nor have we the means to enable us to learn anything about their life and the events from those distant and mysterious times. The few things known about the Slavs from the sources of other peoples in those ages are so obscure, mixed up and biased, that even one-tenth of them cannot be properly understood.

Other nations, bearers and representatives of modern civilization, have the prejudiced view that the Slavs not only have contributed nothing to the culture of mankind, but that they have even been harmful and pernicious to civilization, as from time to time throughout the centuries, with their devastating raids, they have destroyed the treasures of the spiritual enlightenment of the world, created and accumulated through the painstaking efforts of certain nations and endowed with extraordinary virtues and talents. Such enlighteners of humankind were, for example, the ancient inhabitants of the Indus, the Phoenicians, who are considered ancestors of the Hellenes, the Egyptians and some others, who, according to the opinion of Western scholars, used to spread goodness and humanity among people all over the world. In a word, these very same Westerners say that the Slavs had no other gift except that of spreading desolation across the world! The most fearful ravagers of the world throughout the Middle Ages, who turned the entire economy of the pagan ages into ashes—like the Huns, the Tartars, the Vandals, the Goths and so forth—are thought by the same scholars to be the Slavs' closest friends and immediate relations! It is further thought that, before the conversion of the ruler's family in the case of Preslav, the Slavs not only had neither an idea nor a trace of an alphabet and a literature, but also that their common moral virtues and feelings till then were not in the least different from the ones we witness today among the most cruel Asian nomads. I have been hearing this opinion of foreign writers ever since I started gaining knowledge of the world, and those who taught me this were, regretfully, Slavs themselves! Whenever one came to acknowledge something about the importance and services of the aforementioned incomparable enlighteners of humankind, they would always speak with such ornate eloquence that I would be

ashamed by my envy of the happiness I did not have of belonging to whichever of the glorious nations were mentioned, but that I did belong, instead, to one of those who were always compared to the humblest ones.

Since that which was told about the origin of human civilization was blindly believed in, I never heard anyone voice the slightest opposition to it, and therefore I myself, too, could do nothing but believe what I used to hear about it, starting with my first years and throughout all my studies at school.

As it happens, when I settled in my ancient Macedonia, full of precious souvenirs, in order to do research and save the monuments of the past, during my frequent travels undertaken all over the Balkan Peninsula, together with the collecting of antiques, studying and comparing with particular attention and curiosity also the types, affinities, qualities and customs of the various nations, present residents of the aforementioned glorious ancient country, homeland of classical culture, to my utmost amazement and embarrassment I noticed the great difference between what I had heard at school about the Hellenes, and what I learned through experience and saw there, with my own eyes. That is, I saw that the Hellenes lacked many things in respect of their civilizational gift, which should not be this way if all that is told about them, in view of world civilization, were true. To skip everything else, I shall mention here only the main quality, generally considered to be the cornerstone of primary culture in the world, that is, playing music and singing, for which I did not observe even the slightest affinity among modern Greeks, while among Slavic Bulgarians in this country, on the contrary, both are maintained with such extraordinary love and devotion that in this respect it would be difficult for any other Slavic nation to surpass them.

It has often happened to me, in summer, that I travelled through Hellenic fields and meadows, full of workers everywhere, but my ears were not once touched by the slightest sound of song or merriment, and each time the silence on both sides of the road was such that I would think that those working there were not living creatures but automatons. On the contrary, whenever I passed through the lands belonging to the Slavs, I could tell this from a distance, and for no other reason but that of the melodious echo of their songs, flowing far away across mountains and valleys!

As I did not know how to solve this mystery, in such contradiction to my ideas up to then, I finally reached the following conclusion: everything which has been assumed and believed so far about the extraordinary civilizational gift of the Hellenes is groundless, and not only are they not the sole civilizers and mentors of the world, and especially of the South European nations, but

quite the contrary, the Slavs, too, have, from times unknown, possessed their own age-old culture.

As I knew that any assumption, no matter how appropriate it may seem to its author, would be worthless if not confirmed by unquestionable evidence, I began to think how this assumption of mine could be supported with indubitable evidence and how could it be shown as being true. [...]

One part of these monuments originated in prehistoric times, revealing a hitherto unknown world culture, of which no traces can be found in ancient chronicles and writers of history, and whose origin is lost in the darkness of ages. As for the content of these traditions, we can assume that they refer to the prehistoric development of humankind. This is suggested by the fact that many sources mention that these ancient civilizers of the world were surrounded by peoples who were not familiar even with the most common means of existence, like the wooden plough and wheat, or the herd with its milk and cheese, but instead lived on grass, which they used to graze like beasts! Most of these songs mention the migration of the people from the “far lands near the white Danube”; these people can be no other than those who managed to preserve these monuments for so long a time to the present, by passing them orally from father to son. And under “far lands” I think we have to understand some country from East Asia or the Indian Peninsula, while this “white Danube” can hardly be our Danube, but rather, some other great Asian river, perhaps the Indus or Ganges, or even the Oxus or Jaxartes. [...]

Some scholars, with whom I used to communicate one thing or another concerning the meaning of these monuments and the significance they might have for science, would not even listen to my remarks, but instead, would reject them straight away, saying that “everything that has so far existed in the world as good and beneficial, in cultural terms, originated in Homer and came from the Greeks.” In other words, everything which has been believed in and written so far about the origin of world civilization, these scholars consider an indisputable dogma, not to be studied and discussed, but to be believed in blindly. The fact that such a claim is neither appropriate nor fair will be recognized, I think, by every lover of the truth.

That Homer is among the most amazing and important human creations is beyond any doubt, but this does not mean that it is unlikely for someone to become illuminated and see what is there in the darkness, behind him, and what has been before him. Therefore, my intention has never been to cast a shadow on, or question, the importance and significance which the wonderful and incomparable works of Homer have for mankind, I merely wanted to reveal their true and ancient origin, and more specifically, to correct and re-

move the incorrect opinion about the Slavs; that is, since there is, as is well known, great kinship and similarity between the ancient Greek and the Bulgarian languages, as they are branches of the single Indo-European stock, why, then, should the same kinship not be recognized in terms of blood? And yet there is such alienation and opposition between the Greeks and the Slavs, very much like the one between fire and water!

Some people think that, at the beginning, the Greek and the Slavic peoples were totally alike, and that they appeared and bred in the same location. Between one of the four ancient Hellenic dialects, the Doric, and the Slavic language of primeval times the difference was not greater than that between dialects of one and the same language, and only after a long stretch of time, once the two were separated each from the other, little by little did they become completely estranged and followed different courses, while traces only of their past kinship have been preserved in the languages mentioned.

Mine is a different opinion, that is, I think that the culture, traces and memories which can be found in these songs were typical of the Slavs, who brought this from their primeval settlements in the far Asian East, and have preserved and cultivated it by themselves, and in no way did they acquire it from their neighbors in Europe; if, on the basis of the aforementioned similarity of language, some kind of kinship by blood may be assumed, then it has not been immediate, but has been created by mixing—i.e., two completely different tribes, having originated far from each other, in the course of time have merged into one, and this merger must have occurred during the primitive resettlement of humankind. During the said world migrations, part of the Slavs came across the Greeks, or contrarily the latter met the Slavs, and through voluntary mutual agreement and an act of will, or through the use of power, they were subjected to each other, after which they remained together forever. As a matter of fact, we can assume that there must have been mutual marital relations between them, and undoubtedly on a large scale, and for this reason they became related over the course of time, but as I already said, only indirectly. That, at the beginning, the language of the Slavs dominated over the Greek, as can be seen from the Doric dialect, has to be ascribed most probably to maternal influence; thus, little by little, the gentle and submissive blood of the Slavs was completely absorbed in the veins of the Greeks with a Semitic cruelty!

Translated by Elena Alexieva

TEODOSIJ GOLOGANOV: LETTER ON THE RENEWAL OF THE ARCHBISHOPRIC OF OHRID

Title: Untitled letter, written by Skopje's Exarchate Metropolitan Teodosij (dated 22. VI. 1891)

Originally published: Slavko Dimevski, "Нашето минато низ документи," in *Разгледи*, April 1968, pp. 996–1003

Language: the original letter was written in Bulgarian, and published with a Macedonian translation

The excerpts used are from *Одбрани текстови за историјата на македонскиот народ* vol. II., ed. by Ljuben Lape (Skopje: Универзитет Кирил и Методиј, 1976), pp. 291–296.

About the author

Teodosij (secular name Vasil) **Gologanov** [1846, Trlis, near Nevrokop (present-day Bulgaria) – 1926, Sofia]: Orthodox clergyman. He attended monastic schools, finally that of the monastery of St. John near Serres (present-day Greece), and he became a monk in 1862. He was very active in the ecclesiastic-educational municipality of Serres in the 1870s. In 1885, he was appointed the Exarchate Metropolitan in Skopje. After taking up this position in 1890, he campaigned in favor of the idea of revival of the Ohrid archbishopric as a separate Macedonian church in which the Macedonian vernacular would be used in the religious service. Teodosij Gologanov established contacts with the patriarchate in Constantinople in an attempt to persuade its leadership to accept and promote the revival of the Ohrid archbishopric under the patriarchate of Constantinople but with an autonomous status. After the Greek newspapers prematurely broke (and distorted) the news, the Exarchate started proceedings for Teodosij's dismissal. Teodosij's last attempt was to contact the Vatican representative Augusto Bonetti with the aim of negotiating a Greek Catholic (Uniate) archbishopric in Ohrid to serve the territory of Macedonia. The Exarchate, however, with the help of the local Turkish administrative authorities arranged his expulsion from Skopje (1892). For the rest of his life Teodosij Gologanov was denied any higher office in the church hierarchy, and was never appointed again to Macedonian eparchies.

Context

The existence of an archbishopric in Ohrid dates back to the eleventh century. Within the Orthodox ecclesiastic structure it had always enjoyed a certain degree of autonomy. The number of its eparchies kept changing—with a tendency to shrink to the advantage of the Bulgarian and Serbian churches—but it kept the core of its property and its privileged status even after the territories under its jurisdiction fell into the hands of the Ottomans (at the end of the fourteenth century). Although the priests were of Slavic origin its higher clergy consisted of Greeks, and the Greek language was used in the liturgy. Nevertheless, the clash of interests over jurisdiction of territories and income brought the Ohrid archbishopric into conflict with the Patriarchate in Constantinople. The Patriarch pleaded for its abolition, charging that it had become an instrument of the enemies of the Ottoman Empire like Austria and the Vatican. The conflict was brought to an end by an order of the sultan of January 1767, by which the Ohrid archbishopric ceased to exist and the territory under its jurisdiction was handed over to the Patriarchate in Constantinople. After the creation of an independent Greek state, the church infrastructure in the territories still within the Ottoman Empire was used for strengthening Greek cultural domination over the Orthodox population. This was the pillar on which Greek political and cultural ambitions in European of the Ottoman Empire rested. This national program also encompassed non-Greek ethnic groups (Vlachs, Slavs, Albanians), the process being facilitated by the Turkish *millet* system, which identified members of any particular religious community with the name of the dominant, that is the titular nation. It was also very important that the designation ‘Greek’ had a socio-economic connotation, implying membership in a privileged merchant class—in other words, indicating that the person in question was not a peasant. Thus, after the formation of the Greek state in 1830, the regions outside its borders regarded as important from the national perspective, such as Macedonia—the ancient homeland of Aristotle and Alexander the Great—were given careful attention. Numerous schools and churches under the combined control of the Greek state and the Patriarchate in Constantinople were intended to strengthen Greek national identity in these lands. However, the Greek clergy working in the distant Slavic provinces of the Ottoman Empire must have felt complete detachment from their parishioners, with whom even basic communication was difficult; very often their only interest was to extort money through various forms of tax-manipulation. In such conditions, the ‘awakening’ of the Slavic subjects of the sultan was rather an emancipation move-

ment against what was perceived as Greek intrusion into the religious and educational sphere. It was the Bulgarian commercial and educational elites who took the lead in the joint struggle for a Slavic church in the Ottoman Empire. With Russian support and the Turkish authorities' policy of divide and rule, the Bulgarian Exarchate was established in 1870. Extremely important for Macedonia was the tenth article of the agreement, which introduced the right of municipalities to choose by a two-thirds majority of votes to which church they would belong. A Slavic church was exactly what many people in Macedonia were waiting for: in two decades the Exarchate had bishops in Skopje (*Tur.* Üsküb), Veles (*Tur.* Küprülü), Ohrid, Bitola (*Tur.* Monastir), Strumica, Debar and Nevrokop. Along with bishops a large number of Bulgarian schools appeared in Macedonia, since the Bulgarian church also organized education. The Exarchate seemed to be winning the battle with the Greek-dominated Patriarchate for the souls of the Macedonians, provoking the envy of both Greece and the young and ambitious Serbian state.

There is no extant document explaining when and how Teodosij got the idea of the renewal of the Ohrid archbishopric. The only explanation might be that in Macedonia of the time the memory of this local institution was still alive and, due to negative comparisons with the Constantinople Patriarchate, became probably idealized. Gologanov might have been exploiting this type of popular feelings, probably cherishing them himself. His unexpected and surprising campaign against the very existence of the Exarchate's presence in Macedonia and his promotion of a separate religious institution rooted in local ecclesiastic traditions were potentially very harmful to the Bulgarian cause in Macedonia, as represented by the Exarchate, especially since Teodosij not only spoke of 'one corruption being replaced by another' but also endowed the whole argument with national characteristics by describing the Bulgarian Exarchate as yet another foreign body on Macedonian soil. Teodosij's efforts to exploit the stubborn loyalty of Macedonian Slavs to their regional vernacular(s) and traditions only highlighted the delicacy of the problem of the national, religious and regional identity (or identities) of the population of Macedonia. If the term 'Bulgarian(s)' certainly stabilized itself by the end of the nineteenth century, it was far from being capable of erasing from the symbolic field the name 'Macedonia' which continued to produce somewhat parallel political loyalty. Therefore, Teodosij Gologanov touched upon the very essence of the process of creating national institutions. Macedonian historiography, in its quest for all possible displays of local or regional loyalties and particularities resisting neighboring influences, could not overlook Gologanov's abortive efforts. This episode was thus narrated as yet

another autochthonous attempt to emancipate Macedonia, which failed due to interference of the expansionistic neighbors. As for analogies—the present archbishopric of the Republic of Macedonia claims to perpetuate the traditions of the historical Ohrid archbishopric. Its very existence continues to provoke controversy (especially regarding its status *vis-à-vis* the Serbian Orthodox Church), and the wider community of Orthodox Churches does not recognize its autocephalous status.

NI

Letter

To His Worthiness, Dionysus, in Sofia
Skopje, 22. VI. 1891

My dearest brother in Christ,

Strange is the divine mind, and even stranger are His ways. Christ preached love among people and went to the cross for it, while we, in the name of Christ's love and with its holiest symbol the cross, are spreading the greatest hatred amongst people and suppress them spiritually and nationally, persuading them that we do good. So our holy Exarchate, headed by the blessed Exarch Joseph I, does everything possible to persuade the poor Macedonian people that it has good intentions, that it cares about its present and future and wants to rescue them from the darkness of national unawareness and make them a people consciously Bulgarian. And it does not require much for me to persuade you, my dearest brother in Christ, that our holy Exarchate with its ecclesiastical and educational activity here in Macedonia is actually performing the most wretched task of taking away the name of a people and replacing it with another, taking away its mother tongue and replacing it with another, taking away all its national symbols and replacing them with others, all in order to secure for its government and its Bulgarian merchants commercial penetration into new territory. What would you call this, dear brother, if not a new slavery more terrible than the Turkish one? The Turks take the lives and properties of the *rayah*,¹ but do not reach for the spirit. They destroy

¹ Originally it meant all the productive population—i.e., those not part of the military class—that pays taxes and tributes to the Sultan, regardless of religion. Officially abolished in 1839, this term continued to be used unofficially. In the European part of the Ottoman Empire, *rayah* was generally identified with the Orthodox Christian subjects of the Sultan.

the body, but respect the soul. And our holy Exarchate kills the second, the lasting one. Is this a brotherly and a Christian relation?

I write this to you so that you will wonder less about my previous letter in which I expressed my opinion that we, the clergymen who are Macedonians by origin, should unite and move our people to awake and cast off foreign rule, to throw away the Patriarchate and the Exarchate and unite spiritually within the bosom of the Ohrid archbishopric, their true mother church. Is it not about time to stop the national division of one and the same people only because one recognizes the Patriarchate, the other the Exarchate, and the third reveres Mohammed? Is it not about time to stop the hatred amongst brothers? And how can this be done, if not by having our people's church, through the Ohrid archbishopric. I will be sincere, my dear brother in Christ, and tell you openly: we the Macedonians suffer less from the Turks—may the sultan live long—than from the Greeks, Bulgarians and Serbs, who threw themselves on our pitiful country like eagles on a carcass and want to dismember it (“...and they tore up your shirt, O Christ”).

And since I wrote you this, I think you will understand me. I took on myself to renew the Ohrid archbishopric, and from that there is no return. I am not sure if I will succeed, because a lot has been done by our ‘friends’ to come up to this situation. But it is time to start the sowing. Some seed will fall on rock, the birds will eat some, but some will find a fruitful ground and will grow. Let me, if God so wills, be the first victim, but let that victim be useful for my people.

These last days I had a chance to take up some more concrete steps. You know that the Turks will never agree to our creating a new church. But on the other hand, they also do not like the Bulgarians. I had an opportunity to speak here to the *vali* [governor] and he promised me help at the Sublime Porte, if our new church will be put under the patronage of some other church recognized in the empire. Of course, dear brother, he asked that his services be paid, and I can't rely on the local wealthy men, while the poor ones can give nothing. I took 200 liras from my subsidies and gave them to him. Now I think about checking how the Constantinople Patriarch will look upon my plan. I met the local Greek consul in the vicinity of the town, in a nearby spa, and expressed to him my feelings. I told him we were ready to renounce the Exarchate and recognize the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate if the favor is granted us Macedonians to renew the Ohrid archbishopric, abolished at the time by the forceful Patriarch Samuel III Handjeri [Hantzeris] with the help of the High Devlet². We are ready to rec-

² Supreme Council of the Ottoman state.

ognize the Patriarchate as the Universal Throne and obey it in everything, just as the other Orthodox churches do, but only if it has no right to interfere in our matters and if it registers the Ohrid archbishopric in the codex of the Orthodox churches on an equal footing with the others—everything to be the way it had been before. *Graeca fides, nulla fides*: so the consul made no response openly, saying only that he would inform the government in Athens so that it could make a decision. He did not forget to mention to me that the local Greek metropolitan Paisios should not be told any of this, because he would not agree to leave Skopje. For my part I said to him that he does not have to leave Skopje if only he agrees to recognize the Ohrid archbishopric, and why would he not do this when he speaks our language so nicely and on his mother's side he is Macedonian. And not only this—now he has some 200 to 300 families in the town, while by then he would be metropolitan of all Christian souls there, so his bishop's revenues would be ten times bigger. The consul did not respond to this, but only repeated once again that I should not speak about this with Paisios.

I did not believe the consul and did not want to waste time. Through Tome Janakiev³ I organized a meeting with Paisios and told him the plan about the Ohrid archbishopric. At first he started to argue. But isn't he greedy like any other Greek?—for when I told him that we would leave him here in Skopje as metropolitan of the whole population, the man got softer and promised me that he would personally write to the Patriarch and if he agrees I would go to Istanbul and speak to him personally about the whole thing. I told him that for the majority of the eparchies we already have appropriate men to be metropolitans, and in those places where we do not have any we would accept Greek bishops provided they know our, that is, the Macedonian language. I was obliged to make this concession, because you know yourself that it is better to accept as bishops Greeks who speak our language than Bulgarized Macedonians who would make further problems. As for the Greek bishops, as we gradually remove them from office and we will appoint our men in their places. On the other side, the Patriarchate will agree sooner this way than if we turn our backs on them immediately.

Translated by Nikola Iordanovski

³ A local Skopje notable.

MIHAI EMINESCU: POLITICAL ARTICLES

Title: *'Românul' a contractat năravul* ('Românul' has acquired the habit); *Pseudo-'Românul' în 'Semibarbaria' lui* (Pseudo-'Romanian' in its 'semi-barbarity'); *Dar, domnilor, Mi-e rușine* (But, Gentlemen, I am ashamed)

Originally published: *'Românul' a contractat năravul* in *Timpul* (29 July 1881); *Pseudo-'Românul' în 'Semibarbaria' lui* in *Timpul* (25 October 1881); *'Dar, domnilor, Mi-e rușine'* remained in manuscript

Language: Romanian

The excerpts used are from Mihai Eminescu, *Opere* (Bucharest: Ed. Academiei, 1985), vol. XII, pp. 266–268, 378–379; and *Opere* (Bucharest: Ed. Academiei, 1980), vol. IX, pp. 459–460.

About the author

Mihai Eminescu (originally Eminovici) [1850, Botoșani (Bukovina) – 1889, Bucharest]: Poet and journalist. In 1860, he began his schooling in Czernowitz (*Rom.* Cernăuți, *Ukr.* Chernovci). He failed the second grade and went to Sibiu (*Hun.* Nagyszeben, *Ger.* Hermannstadt) in Transylvania. In 1864, he returned to Czernowitz and enrolled at a private lycée. Shortly thereafter, however, he joined a theater company. His father managed to get him back to Czernowitz, where Eminescu published his first poem. However, he abandoned school again and joined the theater company of Iorgu Caragiale, the uncle of the playwright **Ion Luca Caragiale**. He continued writing poetry and published in *Familia*, a prestigious literary journal in Transylvania edited by Iosif Vulcan (1841–1907). It was Vulcan who changed Mihai's name from Eminovici to Eminescu. In 1869 he enrolled at the University of Vienna. There he participated in the foundation of the student association *România Jună* ('Young Romania'). In 1871 the association organized a famous celebration at Putna Monastery in memory of Moldavia's glorious voivode, Stephen the Great (r. 1457–1504). In 1872 Eminescu received a scholarship from 'Junimea,' a literary association founded in 1861 in Iași, and went to Berlin to continue his studies. In 1874, having failed to obtain a doctorate, Eminescu returned to Iași, where he became a school inspector and later the director of the Central Library. In 1877, persuaded by **Caragiale** and Ioan Slavici (1848–1925), he moved to Bucharest and worked until 1883 for the journal *Timpul* (The time), the main conservative newspaper of the period. From 1884 he was constantly hospitalized and died in miserable

conditions in 1889. While he was relatively marginal during his lifetime, Eminescu emerged as the most important figure of the modern Romanian 'cultural canon.' It was the literary critic, **Titu Maiorescu** (1840–1917), who acknowledged the literary talent of the young poet and published his first volume of poetry in 1883. Later on, Eminescu was declared not only the greatest Romanian poet, but also the father of Romanian ethnic nationalism, as opposed to the liberal nationalism of the generation of 1848. During the decades of 'national communism,' he was also greatly manipulated by 'autochthonist' authors (Ilie Bădescu and Zoe Dumitrescu-Buşulenga) and radical nationalists (Ion Lăncrănjan and Corneliu Vadim-Tudor).

Main works: *Poesii* [Poems] (1883); *Proză şi Versuri* [Prose and poems] (1890); *Nuvele* [Novels] (1893); *Literatura populară* [Popular literature] (1902); *Scrieri politice şi literare* [Political and literary writings] (posthumous collection, 1905).

Context

Romania gained independence in 1878 and was proclaimed a kingdom in 1881. The international consolidation of the new state was matched by a series of domestic reforms. Moreover, Romanian politics experienced a period of ideological consolidation, during which two main political groups emerged: liberal and conservative. The Liberal Party was formed in 1875. It claimed to represent the revolutionary tradition of 1848 and advocated the modernization of Romanian society based on the Western European model. The establishment of the Conservative Party followed in 1876. It invoked the autochthonous Romanian tradition as its main source of legitimacy and urged that Romania's rural character should be preserved.

The liberals dominated Romanian politics for a long period (between 1876 and 1888). During this period a new generation of liberal politicians emerged on the political scene. The liberal leaders who had participated in the revolution of 1848 and played a major role in the unification of 1859, such as **Mihail Kogălniceanu**, C. A. Rosetti and **Ion C. Brătianu**, were replaced in the 1880s by a new group of politicians. This new generation, which included Nicolae Fleva, Mihail Pherekyde, Eugen Carada, Vasile Lascăr, P. S. Aurelian and Ion I. C. Brătianu, lacked the political credibility of the 'founding fathers' of the Liberal Party. Corruption and internal political struggles characterized the last decade of liberal governance. Romanian society was confronted with a series of political and economic crises which, in turn, generated a strong reaction from the Conservative Party and conservative intellectuals. Arguments and ideas were debated in Parliament as well as in the press. The main newspapers of the period were *Românul* (The Romanian), representing liberal interests, and *Timpu*, which supported the conservatives.

Mihai Eminescu worked for *Timpul* and published constantly on the main issues of the time. Representing a paradigm-shift in the conservative discourse, three main ideas characterize Eminescu's political articles: traditionalism, ethnic nationalism and anti-Semitism. These themes were connected by an organic vision of Romanian society, which Eminescu developed during his studies in Germany and Austria. The supreme law governing the Romanians, Eminescu argued, was the conservation of nation and country. He compared the rural environment to a biological organism, having a specific pattern of development. The individual was part of an organic whole whose general well-being was conditioned upon the perfect functioning of all its integrative parts.

In contrast, those interested in changing the character of Romanian society were considered to be either foreign or representing the liberal oligarchy ruling the country. Eminescu was a constant critic of liberalism, with which he associated everything that, in his opinion at least, vitiated Romanian values. He did not deny the idea of progress altogether. Progress was inevitable, but only if people followed a certain pattern, a path rigidly defined by the laws of nature. A similar pattern dictated the unique tradition and environment of each nation, and it was only by following this tradition that nations could avoid intellectual anarchy and social disorder. Eminescu attempted to lay down a special pattern for the Romanians by imagining progress as a natural, not a social process. Humans, he believed, are to be seen as solely subject to natural law. It was the idea of human differences that Eminescu used to construct his theory of the 'super-imposed layer' (*'pătura suprapusă'*), namely those categories of people he deemed non-Romanian by tradition and ethnic origin such as Greeks or Jews. Moreover, this organicist framework enabled him to employ a biological language in order to explain the interaction of the 'native' Romanian population with the 'super-imposed layer'. He described this interaction in pathological terms as if it were a disease gnawing at the vitality and sanity of the Romanian national body.

For Eminescu, Romania's rural character had to be preserved unaltered, with the peasant as the guardian of innocence, and purity. Nature and peasantry were idealized. Both were seen as the sole preservers of national identity and were contrasted to the image of the 'city leech,' usually a Jewish or Greek merchant, or a Romanian who was superficially Westernized. With the advancement of economic and political modernization, Romanian society experienced radical mutations. The relations between rulers and ruled, favored and exploited, were exacerbated by a long tradition of ethnic stereotypes. In nineteenth-century Romanian popular imagery, the Jews and the

Greeks came to be represented as parasitic groups, living on the ruthless exploitation of the Romanian rural masses. In his anti-Semitic arguments, Eminescu combined popular stereotypes with a modern rhetoric which he became familiar with in Austria and Germany.

Eminescu's stress on the functional inter-relationships of nature, his hostility to theories of development, and his search for harmony and co-ordination in the natural world, witness a crucial shift in Romanian political language: the Romantic *topoi*, which were until then used mainly by the liberal nationalists, became disentangled from the liberal political discourse and turned to support an anti-liberal agenda. Not surprisingly, many of Eminescu's ideas about the organic nature of Romanian civilization and the necessity of resisting modernization were incorporated into a new nationalist discourse. The nationalists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century (**Nicolae Iorga**, **Aurel C. Popovici** and A. C. Cuza) viewed Eminescu as the primary source of their critique of modernity and democracy. In the interwar period theorists of the right (Nicolae Roșu), political leaders (Corneliu Zelea-Codreanu) and philosophers of culture and religion (**Lucian Blaga**, **Nichifor Crainic**, **Mircea Eliade**) appropriated Eminescu's legacy. The communist regime also managed to create a 'new' Eminescu. On the whole, Eminescu's political articles were largely ignored, although they benefited from an impressive edition initiated by the literary critic, Alexandru Piru, in 1971. After 1989 there was an uncontrolled and largely uncritical revival of Eminescu's political articles, which eventually led to their appropriation by nationalist and traditionalist groups in Romania.

MT

'Românul' has acquired the habit

Românul has acquired the habit of attributing to us articles that we did not write; [these articles were] reproduced from other newspapers, and then directed against *Timpul*, combating it as if they were ours; [the] ideas [presented in these articles] we only partly share, or share with some reserve. This happened in the Saturday issue again, in which we noticed that they debate on the grounds of an article reproduced from *Poșta* [The post] regarding the antagonism between Moldavians and Wallachians. [...] In our opinion, there is no difference within the Romanian race from Wallachia, Moldavia, and most parts of Transylvania and Hungary. It is the same race, with the same interests and abilities.

But in Bucharest and the towns along the Danube there have appeared totally new and hybrid ethnic elements, who have provided our present generation of governors. These are the remains of the scams under the flags of Pazvantoğlu¹ and Ypsilanti², and the numerous remnants of the industrial knights of the Phanar. To this new generation belong people like Giani, Carada, C. A. Rosetti, Pherekydis, Serurie and so on. This élite of the new Phanariots, who have made their way in the country in the last 50–60 years, represents an element of dissolution, demagoguery in Romania. Physical and intellectual monsters, with no traditions or country or definite nationality [...] we see them standing in line with the Jews of Moldavia to paralyze the fight for national emancipation over there. Fired by instinctive hatred for all the historical and autochthonous elements of this country, we have seen them introducing foreign laws in all branches [of life], unadjusted to either the interests or the nature of the country.

These elements are much more numerous in Wallachia than in Moldova, but here they are to be encountered in the centers on the plains, not in the towns on the mountains, nor in the countryside. These creatures are mistaken by Moldavians for the historical population of Wallachia, as they are to be found in villages in general, and especially in Câmpulung, Târgoviște, Târgu-Jiu and so on. These elements are mistakenly called Wallachians by Moldavians, because they are not Wallachians. Therefore: *distinguendum est*.

What the Jews are for Moldavia, these newcomers are for Wallachia, who by their religious identity have always managed to mingle with the Romanians, to fool them and finally get to come to rule them; and so that their job is more successful—they bargained away our national instincts [...]

Therefore, it is enough for these people to be absent from the government, or anyone else, and there will immediately be no difference between one Romanian and another. But with people like Carada, Giani, Cariagdi, C. A. Rosetti, Pherekydis, and so on, Romanians anywhere begin to feel foreign in their own country, and as ‘The Post’ says, the government seems as foreign to them as the Hungarian one to the Transylvanians, or as the Russian to the Bessarabians. This is a mechanical axiom: the effect should be equal to the cause.

¹ Osman Pasha of Vidin (1758–1807), Ottoman governor, who rebelled against the central authorities and established a semi-autonomous state, also making frequent raids in Wallachia.

² Phanariot family, serving as Moldavian and Wallachian hospodars (rulers) in the eighteenth century. **Alexandros Ypsilantis** (1792–1828) led the Greek uprising in the Danubian Principalities in 1821.

Phanariot rule and the continuous inflow of monsters and failures into the plains of Wallachia lasted for 121 years. It was only in 1821 that we hoped that through a long reaction of the national spirit and through the power of assimilation of soil and race we could erase the traces of this odious domination. Only then the cowardly and dishonorable nature of these foreigners did adopt the generous nature of the Romanian nation, and only then could the great-grandchildren of the Caradas be Romanians. The present-day Caradas, even if they wanted to, could not be Romanians, just as from a willow tree one will never be able to make an oak.

The fight of Moldavians against the above-named Wallachians is therefore not directed against the historical elements of Wallachia, but against the non-historical ones. This is a common fight, which every Romanian will join in instinctively, conquering back, piece by piece, the national property. Today it is the language, which these monsters have turned into a nonsense language, the next day the social organization, the day after next the church and the school, one by one. Everything has to be snatched from the hands of these people with an innate incapacity to understand the truth, and lacking in the possibility of patriotism, and everything has to be Dacianized in a way, from here on.

Though the Romanian nation is numerous, its fight is disproportionately heavy, since these people enjoy the support of foreigners. They were brought to power by Russia, and supported by the Austrian-German alliance, so we can see the levers that raise them from the outside, while inside we have only our own people, exploited inhumanly, growing poor, dropping in numbers, and without a clear awareness of what should be done. [...]

But let us not despair. The plant grows in our land. Some strong hands would be necessary, some mountainous hands that know how to use [the plant]. Whether they appear in Moldavia, or across the Olt, as in Tudor's time,³ the nation would welcome them with flowers and carpets laid on the road, as they did when Matei Basarab⁴ entered Târgoviște [...].

Therefore, *distinguendum est* once again. On one side, we have the Romanian race, with its past, identical in all the countries that it inhabits, an honest, generous, truthful and patriotic people. We have above this people a super-imposed layer, a sort of sediment of con men and coquettes, raised from the mixture of Oriental and Occidental flow, incapable of truth and patriotism, the race of the Caradas, whom the Moldavians by mistake call Wallachians.

³ Reference to the revolt of Tudor Vladimirescu (1821).

⁴ Matei Basarab, voivode of Wallachia (1632–1654).

I have set forth this theory repeatedly, but *Românul* has avoided responding to it. This is a very disagreeable issue for a government that is made up mostly of such people, and for a party in which maybe you can find one Romanian out of every ten people. Those who are public servants, especially the ones in high positions, pensioners and deputies; [those who benefit from] public and private goods, in a word those who represent [...] the general life of the country, will notice easily that the reins of power have got out of the hands of the autochthonous and historical elements and into the hands of foreigners. But does this latter element, this hybrid formation claim to be Romanian? Of course it does, for otherwise they would have no reason to be the rulers. But it is not Romanian yet, and it does not yet have the organic possibility to be Romanian.

We do not deny that many elements have been completely assimilated by the Romanian race, but they came here a long time ago, a hundred, two hundred, or maybe two hundred and fifty years ago. But these are not the dominant ones; the fresh immigrants are those who are only second generation, and whose mother tongue is still foreign, and who have been Romanized in terms of language in our schools. However, language by itself does not represent nationality. The moral and intellectual qualities of the race have much more significance. [...]

What is the sign by which we can distinguish these unassimilated persons, of Trans-Danubian origin, from the racially pure population? We claim that these [differences] can be found in all points. We say, through physical and intellectual sterility. [...] [The unassimilated Romanians] are intellectually and physically barren, they are mules in all respects. They either do not breed children at all, or they breed midgets doomed to gradual degeneration and disappearance in the third or fourth generation. Then we notice in them the permanent symptoms of intellectual frailty. Their minds are replaced by slyness. Slyness is a sign of weakness, for the genuine human mind is in direct relationship with the capacity to understand the truth impartially. Falsehood is to be cited as a sign of weak character. They are friendly, sticking to anyone that can help them; in reality, however, they hate any superior power, either intellectual or of character.

‘Pseudo-Romanian’ in its ‘half-barbarity’

[...] A barbarous nation is, for example, religious. Its true religious civilization comes when, through the slow progress of its own manner regarding things related to religious issues, its formal, often superstitious, beliefs turn

into moral conviction. But when it accepts from another people the removal of its formal faith, without replacing it with moral and religious convictions, it remains without both; it only has the evil of civilization and barbarity, it is half-barbarian.

A barbarous nation has its own domestic industry, its craft, its healthy, though perhaps primitive, economic activities. When, instead of developing its own work, it buys ready-made objects from foreigners, without learning how to become able to produce them itself, it is half-barbarous.

The genuine civilization of a people consists not in the adoption of ready-made laws, forms, institutions, labels, or foreign gowns. It consists in its natural, organic development of its own powers, of its own faculties. There is no general human civilization, accessible to all people to the same degree and in the same shape, but each people has its own civilization, though it accepts a lot of elements that are common to other peoples, too.

Therefore, there is a French, English, German, Italian civilization. There is, however, no Romanian civilization, and if there are beginnings, then they are singular and have nothing to do with the general development of things.

The real passage is not from barbarity to half-barbarity, for this is a passage to evil, but from barbarity to genuine civilization. Half-barbarity is not an organic or necessary state, but an illness, a regression, a state of weakness and misery. If there is to be a genuine civilization ever on this earth, then that will spring from the old civilizing elements. The progress of our language will not be connected to the high-pitched or nasal Greek-Bulgarian of the Phanariot century, but to the healthy beginnings established by Ureche or Miron Costin;⁵ legal civilization does not depend on the translation of foreign laws, but on the perfection and completion of our own old laws and judicial life. From one's own roots, in one's own depths springs the genuine civilization of a barbarous people; not from the emulation of foreign customs, foreign languages, or foreign institutions.

Maybe the Slavic people of northern or middle Germany are more civilized 'as humans' than they were in a primitive state but they are no longer Slavic. They vanished into the people whose civilization they received. The Tatar populations of Russia are more civilized today as 'humans' than they were under their khans. But they are Tatar no more; they vanished as such the moment they accepted the way of being of another people.

⁵ Moldavian chroniclers from the seventeenth century.

Half-barbarity is therefore no progress, but regress from the national and political points of view. *Românul* claims that the actual barbarity has taken us in such a short time to independence and a kingdom, to freedom and self-awareness, to progress and prosperity.

Exactly this is what we reject.

Formally independent, we pay a hundred times greater tribute than we used to: the liberty of our populations is, according to statistics, synonymous with the liberty to die in misery; progress and wealth do not characterize the element that ethnically and historically is the only true Romanian one, but rather the Romanians of *Românul*, that super-imposed layer of foreign population incapable of understanding our people, incapable of loving them.

Barbarity and civilization are to each other like the acorn and the roots, the trunk, and the growth of the oak. Half-barbarity is different, it is a disease produced by a foreign environment, the decrepitude that would result if an oak were planted in a marshy, swampy area, and subjected to the regime of the willow. Well, the willow is not a tree, just as the Caradas are not Romanians. In conclusion, any genuine civilization can only consist of a partial return to the past, to its own sound, healthy elements of development.

But, Gentlemen, I am ashamed

But, gentlemen, I am ashamed to be a Romanian! What kind of Romanian! A Romanian who has reserved exclusively for himself the privilege of patriotism and nationality—such a parading Romanian I am ashamed to be. Nationality must be felt with the heart and not spoken with the mouth. What is felt and deeply respected is rarely pronounced! The ancient Jews were not allowed to pronounce the name of God! I love the Romanian people without loving its mediocre and superficial elements.

Translated by Mária Kovács

JÁN KOLLÁR: THE DAUGHTER OF SLÁVA

Title: *Slávy dcera* (The daughter of Sláva)

Originally published: First published in 1821 in Prague under the title *Básně* (Poems) and comprising 86 sonnets. The second edition (1824) in Pest under the title *Slávy dcera* comprised 150 sonnets, including a Prelude and a closing sonnet. Though in subsequent editions in the course of Kollár's life the number of sonnets rose, this second edition was considered the definitive edition after Kollár's death.

Language: Czech

Translation taken from Paul Selver, *An Anthology of Czechoslovak Literature* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1929), pp. 42–46.

About the author

Ján (or, in Czech, **Jan**) **Kollár** [1793, Mosóc (*Slo.* Mošovce, present-day Slovakia) – 1852, Vienna]: poet, writer, linguist and Lutheran priest. Kollár was a Slovak by origin, but wrote in Czech. He studied at Latin schools in Upper Hungary and at the Lutheran lyceum in Prešporok (*Hun.* Pozsony, *Ger.* Pressburg, today's Bratislava). A formative experience was his study at the Faculty of Protestant Theology at the University of Jena in 1817–19, where he came into contact with the 'Young German' national and democratic movement and Romantic literature. In Jena he also met a parson's daughter, Friederika Wilhelmina Schmidt, who became his muse (*Mína*) and whom he married much later in 1835. He spent most of his life in Pest as a priest at a German-Slovak parish. Though influenced by Romantic political ideas in his youth, in his later years Kollár did not share the enthusiasm for overall democratization and republicanism. Instead, he adopted a loyalist attitude to the House of Habsburg and was critical of the revolutionary movement in the late 1840s. Towards the end of his life he was given the chair of Slavic archaeology and mythology at Vienna University. He was a firm promoter of the idea of linguistic Czechoslovakism that was for him a first step in the coming reunion of all Slavic languages. Together with Pavel Josef Šafařík, he is considered the creator of the 'Slav myth' in the Austrian monarchy in the early decades of the nineteenth century. From a literary point of view he is highly appreciated for his poetic language and considered to be one of the greatest neo-Classical poets in modern Czech and Slovak literature.

Main works: *Básně Jana Kollára* [Poems of Jan Kollár] (1821); *Slávy dcera* [The daughter of Sláva] (1824); *O literárnej vzájemnosti mezi kmeny a nářečím*

slovanskými [On the literary reciprocity among the Slavic tribes and dialects] (1836); *Staroitalia slavjanská* [Ancient Slavic Italy] (1853); *Cestopis obsahující cestu do Horní Itálie a přes Tyrolsko a Bavorsko, ze zvláštním ohledem na slavjanské živly 1841, konanou* [A travel journal about a journey in 1841 to Upper Italy and thence through the Tyrol and Bavaria, with special attention paid to Slavic elements] (1862).

Context

Interest in Slavic studies appeared among scholars in Central and Eastern Europe as early as the last third of the eighteenth century. It was not completely new, a vague 'Slav' consciousness having existed in the region as well as in the West Balkans (in the form of Illyrism) for centuries. From now on, however, Slavism in various forms started to be a subject of systematic studies and later even cultural and political thinking. In Bohemia the greatest promoter of this endeavor was the Czech linguist and literary historian **Josef Dobrovský**. If his approach can be characterized as a predominantly scholarly one, the research on Slavonic languages and archaeology done by the next generation of Czech and Slovak intellectuals was more emotionally and politically charged.

The two most important representatives of this new type of Slav idea were the Slovaks Pavel Josef Šafařík (Pavol Jozef Šafárik) (1795–1861) and Ján Kollár, both writing in Czech (the literary language of the Slovak Lutherans, because of their Protestant education, being biblical Czech). Though they spent most of their politically and culturally active lives outside their native linguistic area, they contributed significantly to the new nationalist myth of Slavdom. Šafařík was a scholar who devoted himself to the task of demonstrating the antiquity and the equality of the Slavs in Europe. In his research he built upon the work of older scholars in Slavonic studies such as August Ludwig Schlözer, Josef Dobrovský, Wawrzyniec Surowiecki, and Jernej Kopitar. In his efforts, though, Šafařík was more detailed and systematic than his predecessors and contributed to the spread of Slavic studies throughout the academic world. Kollár was more of a publicist and poet, but his contribution to the myth of Slavness was probably even more substantial. It was his vast cycle of sonnets, *Slávy dcera*, which made him famous. This contained all the important Pan-Slav ideas which he elaborated on in his prose as well. Philosophically, Kollár, as well as Šafařík, had been influenced by Herder's notion of *Humanität* and his 'prophecy' regarding the future of the Slavs in Europe. Not only did they espouse the imaginary cultural unity of the Slavs as their predecessors had, but, using the ideas of a unified German

nation as proposed by the *Burschenschaften* (both having studied in Jena, the mainspring of the *Burschenschaft*-movement), they made a step towards a programmatic Pan-Slav ideology. Although the concept of the nation is ambiguous in his writings, Kollár spoke of the Slavs as a single, biologically designated nation with many dialects. This assumption had a vaguely political implication. Belonging to a large nation should have protected the respective 'tribes'; that is to say, Czechs and Slovaks should have been safer as components of one great and advanced culture. For Kollár, the cultural reciprocity of all Slavs was the main task of the different Slavic tribes, but it did not necessarily imply political unity. In this respect, Kollár was a true disciple of Herder and promoted the non-political and non-state-centered concept of the nation that can be applied to many countries.

With the first edition of *Slávy dcera* in 1824 Kollár created a new patriotic form of poetry with an erotic underpinning, which became a canonical model in Czech and Slovak literature with respect to both aesthetics and the expression of national emotions. In his sonnets he saw his love Mína and his motherland Slavia as identical. As Mína is a daughter of the goddess Sláva, an incorporation of patriotic ideals and the materialized vision of Slav reciprocity, the patriotic and erotic feelings of the poet unite in a natural way. In this way 'subjective' or 'individual' aspects dissolve in a supra-individual, collective whole of the Slav nation. In the Prelude Kollár laments over the present misery of the Slav nation, contrasting it to past glory, and gives an account of its imaginary geography. Despite the predominantly elegiac tone, the Prelude closes with an optimistic vision of the future development of humankind and the Slav nation.

Slávy dcera had a great impact on many Czech and Slovak poets, who were fascinated by its language. Literary assessments have stressed the originality of Kollár's poetics and seen his Pan-Slav ideas as more or less a result of fashionable Romantic ideas. On the other hand, the intellectual history approach tends to emphasize Kollár's cultural-political program and his influence on the Pan-Slav movement. As a matter of fact, in the Czech and Slovak national movements the Slav idea played a controversial role. It encouraged the Czech and Slovak self-consciousness of being part of a greater Slav community. Slav identity, however, never seriously challenged the emerging Czech identity, but remained a supportive element in the ideology of the Czech national movement. Pan-Slav ideas were remarkably strong among the Romantic generation of Czech patriots (**Josef Jungmann**, Antonín Marek, Václav Hanka, F. L. Čelakovský). They also saw Russia as playing the leading role in the Slav movement. They did not, however, intend

to sacrifice the Czech language and identity (to which they had devoted their lives) to an illusory ‘Russification.’ This sceptical tendency indeed strengthened after the brutal suppression of the Polish ‘November Uprising’ in 1830/31, which undermined belief in a natural Slav “harmony and solidarity.” Among Slovak patriots, Kollár’s Pan-Slav vision became rather isolated after **Ľudovít Štúr**’s successful separation of the Slovak national movement from Czech patronage during the 1840s.

MK

The Daughter of Sláva

Here lies the country, alas, before my tear-laden glances,
 Once ’twas the cradle, but now – now ’tis the tomb of my race;
 Check thou thy steps, for the places are sacred, wherever thou turnest.
 Son of the Tatra arise, cast to the heavens thy gaze,
 Or to the mighty old oak, that stands there yonder, incline thee,
 Holding its own against treacherous time, till to-day.
 Ah, but more evil than time, is the man, who a sceptre of iron,
 Slavia, on thy neck, here in these lands has imposed;
 Worse than savage encounters and fiercer than fire and than thunder –
 He who in frenzy blind covers his kindred with shame.
 O ye years of the past that as night are lying around me,
 O my country, thou art image of glory and shame;
 From the treacherous Elbe o’er the plain to the Vistula faithless,¹
 From the Danube until Baltic’s insatiate foam.
 Where the mellifluous tongue of the sturdy Slavs once resounded.
 Now it, alas! is still, silenced by onslaughts of hate.
 Who has committed this theft that cries for vengeance to heaven?
 Who has upon one race outraged the whole of mankind?
 Blush thou for shame, O envious Teuton, the neighbour of Sláva,
 Many such sins have thine hands often committed of old.
 Ne’er has an enemy yet shed blood – or ink – so profusely,
 As by the German was shed, compassing Sláva’s decay;
 Worthy of freedom is only he who values all freedom,

¹ Up to the mid-12th century this territory was inhabited by Polabian Slavs, before they were partly exterminated, partly Germanized.

He who puts captives in bonds – he is a captive himself.

[...]

Far to the right I gaze, to the left I searchingly turn me,

But 'tis in vain that my eye Sláva in Slavia seeks.

Tell me, thou tree, their temple of nature,² under whose shadow

They to primeval gods offerings formerly burnt,

Where are these nations, and where are their princes and where are their cities,

They who the first in the North called into being this life?

They taught the use of sails and oars to indigent Europe,

Taught how to sail o'er the sea, passing to bountiful shores.

Out of the ore-laden depths they dug the metals concealed there,

More from respect for the gods rather than profit to men;

They taught the farmer to till the bosom of the Earth with the plough-share,

So that the lands that were bare yielded the golden-hued corn.

They by the peaceful paths, the lime-tree sacred to Sláva,

Planted and scattered around fragrance and shadowy rest.

[...]

Where in marble arose the halls of the thunderer Perun,³

Now from the ruins distress shelter for the cattle has been made;

Where to the heavens uprose the old-famed towers of Arkona,⁴

Yonder the stranger's foot tramples the fragments to dust.

There they bewail the ruins of Retra's temples, the famous,⁵

Where they arose now dig lizard and serpent their nest.

The son of Sláva who comes from this land to visit his brother,

Is to his brother unknown, presses not warmly his hand;

Strange is his language that comes from his lips and from countenance Slav,

Countenance seemingly Slav sadly the hearing deceives.

For on her sons right deeply has Sláva imprinted her tokens,

Nor can the place or the time ever their traces erase;

Just as two rivers whose waters a single bed has united,

² Here the linden is referred to, the sacred tree of Slavs.

³ In Slavic mythology the god of thunder. Especially among Eastern Slavs he is worshipped as the highest deity.

⁴ A site of a fortified settlement on Rügen island, a religious center of Baltic Slavs destroyed by the King of Denmark, Waldemar I the Great, in 1168.

⁵ Main site of the most powerful tribe of Wieletes, the Redars, with a pagan Slavic temple and golden idol of the god Radegast (Radogost, Riedigost) installed on an island at Tollensee in Mecklenburg, destroyed by the Holy Roman Emperor Otto I the Great, in 955.

Still for long on the way parted their colours remain;
 So by violent strife are these nations confusedly mingled,
 Yet does their nature till now visibly sundered remain.
 But have degenerate sons heaped often upon their own mother
 Curses, and yet in their guilt cringed to the stepmother's lash;
 They in their nature are neither Slav or Teuton, but bat-like,
 Half of the nature of one, half of the other possess.

[...]

Forest, stream, town and village unwilling their titles Slavonic
 Altered; the form but remains, the spirit of Sláva is gone.
 O who will come, these graves from a living dream to awaken?
 Who will the rightful heir back to his country restore?
 Who will tell us the place where Miliduch⁶ bled for his nation?
 Who will a monument raise, keeping his memory fresh?

[...]

Now there are none remaining; the boorish countryman's ploughshare,
 Crashing destructively on, breaks up the warrior's bones;
 Wroth at the worthlessness of two generations, their shadows
 Haunt the dim mist of decay, uttering cries of lament.
 Uttering cries of lament that Fortune relentless continues
 Letting their grandsons' blood either decay or be changed;
 Coldly in sooth would beat the heart of a man for his nation
 If he would shed no tears here, even as o'er his love's bones.
 Ah, but be silent, O grief, serenely beholding the future,
 Scatter with eye like the sun thoughts that arose in a cloud.
 Greatest of evils it is, in misfortune to wrangle with evil,
 He who assuages by deeds anger of heaven does best.
 Not from a troubled eye springs hope, but from hands that are active;
 Thus, and thus only, can now evil be turned into good.
 Only the man, but not mankind can wander astray on the journey,
 Oft the confusion of some favours the rest as a whole.
 Time changes all, and by time truth is to victory guided,
 What in their error the years planned in a day is o'erthrown.

Translated by Paul Selver, in Paul Selver, *An Anthology of Czechoslovak Literature* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1929), pp. 42–46.

⁶ The prince and military leader of Lusatian Sorbs, defeated by Charlemagne in 806.

ADAM MICKIEWICZ: PAN TADEUSZ

Title: *Pan Tadeusz, czyli Ostatni zajazd na Litwie: Historia szlachecka z roku 1811 i 1812 we dwunastu księgach wierszem* (Pan Tadeusz or the last foray in Lithuania: History of the *szlachta* from 1811 and 1812 in twelve parts)

Originally published: First published in Paris in 1834 (in two volumes)

Language: Polish

Modern Polish edition: Adam Mickiewicz, *Pan Tadeusz czyli ostatni zajazd na Litwie: Historia szlachecka z r. 1811 i 1812 we dwunastu księgach wierszem*, ed. Konrad Górski, (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1989). English edition: *Pan Tadeusz or the last foray in Lithuania: History of szlachta from 1811 in twelve parts*, translated by Kenneth R. Mackenzie (London: Polska Fundacja Kulturalna, 1986), the excerpts used are from pp. 3–6; 562–568, and 578–584.

About the author

Adam Mickiewicz [1798, Zaosie near Nowogródek (*Bel.* Novaharodak present-day Belarus) – 1855, Istanbul]: poet. Acknowledged as the greatest Polish poet, Adam Mickiewicz was born into a family of petty gentry in the Lithuanian part of the former Commonwealth. During his studies in Wilno (*Lit.* Vilnius), he co-organized a Polish patriotic *Burschenschaft* called the *Towarzystwo Filomatów* (Philomaths' Society), in which young students from Lithuania learned together and read each other's poems. The Russian authorities dissolved this 'dangerous' organization and the students were deported to Siberia and other parts of Russia. Before the collapse of the *Towarzystwo Filomatów*, Mickiewicz published his first volume of 'Poetry' (1822), which is considered to have opened the period of Romanticism in Polish literature (he also prepared a theoretical introduction presenting the program of romantic poetry, arguing that it has its origins in medieval lyric and in folklore). In his poems, Mickiewicz directed the usual romantic obsessions with agony, horror and death to specifically national subjects. After months of imprisonment in a former Basilian monastery (later adapted as the setting of the third part of *Dziady*), Mickiewicz spent several years in Russia where he met Pushkin, the revolutionaries Alexander Bestuzhev and Kondraty Ryleyev, and the intellectual elite of St. Petersburg and Moscow. Starting in 1829, Mickiewicz began his travels throughout Western Europe. In 1830 he unsuccessfully tried to return to the 'Congress Kingdom' in

order to participate in the uprising. In 1832 he moved to Dresden and finally to Paris, where he published a series of celebrated poems and radical political articles, and also delivered lectures on Slavonic literature at the *Collège de France*. He was radical in all these fields: his journalism advocated socialist ideas and his poetry canonized Polish Messianism, an inseparable mixture of religious, social and national beliefs bound up with Poland imagined as the 'Christ of nations.' His lectures were under surveillance by the French secret police and by agents of the Russian embassy, and were finally called off for their democratic tendency. In the 1840s Mickiewicz became a member of an Adventist sect—fashionable in émigré intellectual circles—led by Andrzej Towiański (1799–1878). The group was characterized by sophisticated religious speculations and professed the brotherhood of nations, which eventually led them to insert the actions of the partitioning powers into a scheme of universal salvation. What most shocked the émigré society was their appeal to forgive the tsar everything he had done to Poland. The Towiański affair cost Mickiewicz much of his authority among Polish exiles. Mickiewicz, however, remained active in the political and social life of Polish immigrants in France. During the revolution of 1848, he organized Polish forces to support the struggle for Italian independence and unity. He also tried to form a Jewish Legion. In 1849 he joined the radical democratic newspaper *La Tribune des Peuples*. After the 'Spring of Nations,' Mickiewicz lost his position at the Collège de France, and worked as a librarian. He died in Turkey, trying once again to organize Polish military units, this time to support the Turks in the Crimean War. Mickiewicz's impact on Polish culture and collective memory can only be compared to that of **Henryk Sienkiewicz**. That he became a 'cult figure' after his death was partly due to the efforts of his son, Władysław Mickiewicz, who collected and selected documents and works of his father and prepared a gigantic biography (published in 1890–1895), in which Mickiewicz was presented not only as a brilliant poet but also as a patriot and a moral authority. Władysław Mickiewicz did not hesitate to destroy those documents that did not fit the image of his father as a national poet. In the inter-war period the poet and translator Tadeusz Boy-Żeleński organized a campaign against the 'bronzers' (*brązownictwo*), criticizing Władysław Mickiewicz for his attempts to turn the real personality of his father into a 'bronze' monument and paragon of all possible virtues. Despite the intellectual controversy surrounding *brązownictwo*, Mickiewicz still belongs to the mainstream of the Polish cultural canon, subscribed to by the full spectrum of intellectual movements from the anti-romantic positivists to Marxists and various branches of nationalists.

Main works: *Poezje*, vol. 1 (1822); *Poezje*, vol. 2 (1823); *Dziady* [The Forefathers] (1823–1832); *Księgi narodu i pielgrzymstwa polskiego* [Books of the Polish nation and pilgrimage] (1832); *Pan Tadeusz*, 2 vols., (1834); *Konrad Wallenrod* (1828); *Les Slaves* (1849).

Context

Pan Tadeusz reflects the bitter disappointment of Polish émigrés after the collapse of the 'November Uprising' (1830–1831). During the first years of their exile, they hoped that the independence of Poland could be restored within months, or at most a couple of years. As years passed and the hope of freedom for Poland receded, they became more nostalgic. *Pan Tadeusz* is a

reevaluation of the national past, and in particular the heritage of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, in all its splendor (though seen in a peripheral village) and comic traits. Unlike the bitter accusations against the archaic system of gentry republicanism raised by both enlightened and radical romantic critics, Mickiewicz wrote a profoundly nostalgic poem. The first readers of the story, the radical democrats, signaled precisely the social conservatism of *Pan Tadeusz*, manifested—according to them—in its idealized picture of the gentry and a lack of interest towards the masses. In this respect Mickiewicz offered a poetic appendix to the popular novel *Pamiętki Soplicy* by the ultra-conservative **Henryk Rzewuski**. Nevertheless, apart from creating an image of the bygone *Rzeczpospolita*, Mickiewicz sought to analyze the questions of Polish independence, the meaning of the national struggle and—last but not least—the destiny of the political émigrés.

According to the plot of the poem, Tadeusz (evoking the name of **Tadeusz Kościuszko**) moves back home from university and meets two beautiful ladies: the young and innocent Zosia and the more experienced Telimena. His hesitation between the two women builds up the ‘love story’ within the poem. The second level of the plot describes the struggle between the two families, the Horeszko (Zosia is a poor relative of Prince Horeszko) and the Soplica (Tadeusz is the youngest Soplica). The third motif is the story of the priest Robak, who hides his identity and organizes (together with Jankiel, a Jewish innkeeper) a patriotic conspiracy to support Napoleon in case he invades Russia. These stories culminate in two ‘military actions’: the fight of Polish *szlachta* from Soplicowo against a Russian regiment, and Napoleon’s campaign against Russia in 1812.

The selected fragments are among the best known and most popular. The invocation to Lithuania was traditionally interpreted as a canonical manifesto of Polish patriotism, and it was many times travestied by other Polish (and foreign, e.g., Svatopluk Čech, Antanas Baranauskas) poets. The tricky question, that a Polish poet declares his love for Lithuania (meaning Belarusian Novaharodak and its countryside), was often left aside. Thus Mickiewicz is also patron of those who, like Czesław Miłosz and Tomáš Venclova, do not identify themselves fully with any national state but declare their attachment to the heritage of the multinational Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The second fragment describes a concert given by Jankiel, whose improvisation symbolizes current political events: the partitions, the **Targowica Confederation**, the Legions of General Dąbrowski (see **Józef Wybicki**, *Dąbrowski Mazurka*) and the hopes attached by the Poles to Napoleon. Jankiel is a prototype of the ‘good Jew’ present in many Polish literary works and in the late-nineteenth

century competing with the figure of the ‘parasitic Jew’ who exploits Polish peasants. The final fragment differs in tone. It contrasts the pictures of the Lithuanian countryside with foreign cities where Polish émigrés found their refuge. It also reminds the reader that the next generations were, as Mickiewicz put it, “black with mourning clothes,” and the whole story is only a nostalgic picture of the times that had already passed.

Gradually, *Pan Tadeusz* became one of the crucial texts of the Polish cultural canon. It still enjoys popularity; it is read in school and students learn passages by heart. Its interpretation never demanded such a degree of theoretical sophistication as Mickiewicz’s Messianic poetry. It is filled with a lyrical serenity of universal appeal and is seemingly free from direct revolutionary connotations.

MG

Pan Tadeusz or the last foray¹ in Lithuania

O Lithuania, my country, thou
 Art like good health; I never knew till now
 How precious, till I lost thee. Now I see
 Thy beauty whole, because I yearn for thee.

O Holy Maid, who Częstochowa’s shrine
 Dost guard and on the Pointed Gateway shine
 And watchest Nowogródek’s pinnacle!
 As Thou didst heal me by a miracle
 (For when my weeping mother sought Thy power,
 I raised my dying eyes, and in that hour
 My strength returned, and to Thy shrine I trod
 For life restored to offer thanks to God),
 So by a miracle Thou ‘lt bring us home.
 Meanwhile, bear off my yearning soul to roam
 Those little wooded hills, those fields beside

¹ Foray (*zajazd*)—according to traditional regulations, the citizens of the *Rzeczpospolita* (that is, the gentry) had a duty to support the juridical system and punish the sentenced man by organizing a *zajazd*, i.e., a military occupation of his estate lasting as long as the host abides by the sentence. *Pan Tadeusz* describes a parody of a *zajazd*.

The vari-painted cornfields like a quilt,
The silver of the rye, the wheatfields' gilt;
Where amber trefoil, buck-wheat white as snow,
And clover with her maiden blushes grow,
And all is girdled with a grassy band
Of green, whereon the silent pear trees stand.
Such were the fields where once beside a rill
Among the birch trees on a little hill
There stood a manor house, wood-built on stone;
From far away the walls with whitewash shone,
The whiter as relieved by the dark green
Of poplars, that the autumn winds would screen.
It was not large, but neat in every way,
And had a mighty barn; three stacks of hay
Stood near it, that the thatch could not contain;
The neighbourhood was clearly rich in grain;
And from the stooks that every cornfield filled
As thick as stars, and from the ploughs that tilled
The black-earthed fields of fallow, broad and long,
Which surely to the manor must belong,
Like well-kept flower beds – everyone could tell
That plenty in that house and order dwell.
The gate wide open to the world declared
A hospitable house to all who fared.

Across the courtyard swung a coach and pair,
And drove up to the porch and halted there.
A young esquire alighted; left to wait,
The horses nibbled slowly towards the gate.
The house was empty and the doors were shut
And barred, and through the bars the bolt was put.
The traveller looked for none to let him in,
Unbarred the door and quickly ran within.
Since he had seen the house long years had past,
And now, his schooling over, he returned at last.
The ancient walls he hastened to behold
As tenderly as they were friends of old.
The hangings and the furniture that day
Were just as when a child he used to play,

But smaller and less beautiful withal,
 And the same portraits hung upon the wall.
 There in Krakovian coat Kościuszkowski stands,
 Eyes raised to heaven, a sword in his two hands;
 Thus at the altar steps he pledged his word
 To drive the powers from Poland with that sword,
 Or fall on it. Beyond him, Polish-dressed
 Sits Rejtan² mourning liberty suppressed,
 Holding against his heart a pointed knife,
 The *Phædo* lying near and *Cato's Life*.
 Next, young Jasiński³, melancholy, fair,
 And Korsak⁴ his true friend – inseparable pair,
 Stand on the walls of Praga⁵ laying low
 The Muscovites, while fires about them glow.
 There, too, beside the alcove in its place
 He saw the chiming clock in wooden case;
 With childish joy the young man pulled the string
 To hear Dąbrowski's old mazurka ring.

[...] Jankiel was very fond of Zosia, so
 He bowed his beard his willingness to show.
 They brought the dulcimer and fetched a chair,
 And sat him in the middle of them. There
 He sat and, taking up the instrument,
 He looked at it with pride and deep content;
 As when a veteran hears his country's call
 Whose grandsons take his sword down from the wall,
 And laughs: it's long since he has held the blade,
 But yet he feels it will not be betrayed.

Meanwhile two pupils knelt before the Jew,
 And turbed the strings and tested them anew.

² Tadeusz Rejtan (1742–1780), deputy of Nowogródek in the Polish parliament who protested against the first partition of Poland in 1772. He later committed suicide.

³ Jakub Jasiński (1761–1794), Polish Jacobin and leader of the Kościuszkowski insurrection in Lithuania, who died during the “slaughter of Praga.”

⁴ Rajmund Korsak (1768–1817), poet and friend of Jasiński.

⁵ Praga, a part of Warsaw on the right bank of the Vistula. In 1794, after a siege, Russian troops led by Suvorov murdered several thousands of its inhabitants.

With half-closed eyes he sat still in his chair,
And held the hammers motionless in air.

At first he beat out a triumphal strain,
Then smote more quickly like a storm of rain,
They were amazed – but this was but a trial,
He suddenly stopped and raised the sticks awhile.

He played again: the hammers on the strings
Trembled as lightly as mosquito's wing
And made a humming sound that was so soft
'Twas hardly heard. The master looked aloft
Waiting for inspiration, then looked down
And eyed his instrument with haughty frown.

He lifts his hands, then both together fall
And smite at once, astonishing them all.
A sudden crash bursts forth from many strings
As when a band of janissaries rings
With cymbals, bells and drums. And now resounds
The Polonaise of May the Third! It bounds
And breathes with joy, its notes with gladness fill;
Girls long to dance and boys can scarce keep still.
But of the old men every one remembers
That Third of May, when Senators and Members
In the assembly hall with joy went wild,
That King and Nation had been reconciled;
'Long live the King, long live the Sejm!' they sang,
'Long live the Nation!' through the concourse rang.

The music ever louder grew and faster,
Then suddenly a false chord – from the master!
Like hissing snakes or shattering glass, that chilled
Their hearts and with a dire foreboding filled.
Dismayed and wondering the audience heard:
Was the instrument ill-turned? or had he erred?
He had not erred! He struck repeatedly
That treacherous string and broke the melody,
And ever louder smote that sullen wire,

What dared against the melody conspire,
 Until the Warden, hiding face in hand,
 Cried out, 'I know that sound, I understand;
 It's *Targowica!*' Suddenly, as he speaks,
 The string with evil-omened hissing breaks;
 At once the hammers to the treble race,
 Confuse the rhythm, hurry to the bass.

And ever louder grew the music's roar,
 And you could hear the tramp of marching, war,
 Attack, a storm, the boom of guns, the moans
 Of children, and a weeping mother's groans.
 So splendidly the master's art resembled
 The horror of a storm, the women trembled,
 Remembering with tears that tale of grief,
The Massacre of Praga; with relief
 They heard the master's final thunder hushed,
 As if the voices of the strings were crushed.

They've scarce recovered from their marvelling,
 The music changes and a murmuring
 Begins: at first a few thin strings complain
 Like flies that struggle in the web in vain,
 But more and more come up and forming line,
 The scattered notes in troops of chords combine;
 And now with measured pace they march along
 To make the mournful tune of that old song:
*The wandering soldier through the forest goes,
 And often faints with hunger and with woes.
 At last he falls beside his charger brave
 That with his hoof-beat digs his master's grave.*
 A poor old song, to Polish troops so dear!
 The soldiers recognised it, crowding near
 Around the master; listening, they recall
 That dreadful hour when o'er their country's fall
 They sang this song, and went to distant climes;
 And to their minds came memories of those times,
 Of wandering through frosts and burning sands
 And seas, when oft in camps in foreign lands

This Polish song had cheered and comforted.
Such were their thoughts, and each man bowed his head.

But soon they lifted up their heads again,
The master raised the pitch and changed the strain.
He, looking down once more, the strings surveyed,
And, joining hands, with both the hammers played:
Each blow was struck so deftly and so hard,
That all the strings like brazen trumpets blared,
And from the trumpets to the heavens sped
That march of triumph: *Poland is not dead!*
Dąbrowski, march to Poland! With one accord
They clapped their hands, and 'March, Dąbrowski!' roared.

The player by his own song seemed amazed;
He dropped the hammers and his arms upraised;
His fox-skin hat upon his shoulders slipped;
His floating beard majestically tipped;
Upon his cheeks two strange red circles showed,
And in his eye a youthful ardour glowed.
And when at last his eyes Dąbrowski met,
He hid them in his hand, for they were wet.
'Our Lithuania has waited long for you,'
He said, 'as Jews for their Messiah do.
Of you the singers long did prophesy,
Of you the portent spoke that filled the sky.
Live and wage war!' He sobbed, the honest Jew,
He loved our country like a patriot true.
Dąbrowski gave the Jew his hand to kiss,
And thanked him kindly for his courtesies.

[...] To think of such things in a Paris street,
Where on my ears the city's noises beat
With lies and curses, and with plans ill-fated,
And fiendish quarrels and regrets belated!

Alas for us who fled in times of pest
And, timid souls, took refuge in the west!
Terror pursued wherever we might go,

In every neighbour we discerned a foe;
At last they bound us up in fetters tight,
And bade us die as quickly as we might.

But if the world will not regard their woe,
If every moment fresh news strikes a blow,
Sounding from Poland like a funeral bell,
If gaolers wish them to an early hell,
And foes like hangmen offer them a rope,
If even in high heaven they see no hope –
No wonder that they hate the world, mankind,
Themselves, and by their torments reft of mind
They spit upon themselves, each other bite.

I longed to fly, a bird of feeble flight,
Beyond the thunder and the stormy zone,
And seek the sunshine and the shade alone,
The homely plot and endless childhood days...
One happiness remains: when evening greys,
You sit with a few friends and lock the door,
And by the fireside shut out Europe's roar,
Escape in thought to happier time and tide,
And muse and dream of your own countryside...

But of those wounds that run so fresh with blood,
And of the tears that over Poland flood,
And of the glory that does yet resound,
The heart to think of these we never found...
For in such torments even Valour stands
And gazes, and can only wring her hands.

Those generations black with mourning clothes,
That air so pregnant with so many oaths,
Our thought dared not to wing its passage there,
Where e'en the birds of thunder fear to fare.

O Mother Poland, thou that in this hour
Art laid within the grave – what man hath power
To speak of thee today? Whose lips would dare

To boast that they will find that word so rare
That it shall melt marmoreal despair,
And lift the gravestone from the hearts of men,
And unlock eyes that brim with tears again,
And shall release the frozen tide of tears?
Those lips shall not be found in many years.

Sometimes when lions of vengeance cease to roar,
And trumpets hush and armies are no more,
When the last enemy shall make his dying cry,
Be dumb and to the world give liberty,
And when our eagles in their lightning flight
On Brave Bolesław's boundaries shall light,
And eat their fill of flesh, and drunk with gore
Shall fold their wings to rest for evermore,
Then, then our knights with oak leaves shall be crowned,
And fling aside their swords, and sit around
Unarmed! the world shall envy them at last,
And when they hear us singing of the past,
Then they shall weep upon their fathers' pain,
And on their cheeks the tears shall leave no stain.
For us unbidden guests in every clime
From the beginning to the end of time
There is but one place in this planet whole
Where happiness may be for every Pole –
The land of childhood! that shall aye endure
As holy as a first love and as pure,
Unshattered by the memory of mistake,
That no deceitful hopes can ever shake,
And that the changing tide of life cannot unmake.
How gladly I would greet in thought those lands,
Where I would seldom weep nor wring my hands,
The lands of childhood; everywhere we roved
As in a meadow, and the flowers we loved
Were sweet and fair; the harmful weed
We flung aside, nor would the useful heed.

That happy country, poor and small!
The world is God's but that was ours – ours all,

And all belonged to us that lay around.
How we remember everything we found,
The linden with her crown magnificent,
That to the village children shadow lent,
And every little rivulet and stone.
How every corner of the place was known,
And far as the next house was all our own!

And only those who were its denizens
Remain my sure allies, my faithful friends.
And who are they? My mother, brothers, all
My kin and neighbours. And when one did fall,
How often was the name of him still spoken!
How many memories, what grief unbroken –
That land where servants more for masters care
Than wives do for their husbands elsewhere,
And where soldier mourns his weapons more
Than sons their fathers here; and where they pour
More tears, and grief is longer, more sincere,
For a dead dog than for a hero here.
And in those days my friends would oft afford
Help for my song, and threw me word on word;
As on the desert isle those cranes once heard,
When o'er the fairy palace they were flying,
From the enchanted boy a mournful crying,
And each one threw a single feather down,
And he made wings and flew back to his own.

Would I might live to see the happy day
When under the thatched roofs these books shall stray,
Where country girls with nimble fingers rove
The spinning wheel and sing the songs they love
About that girl, whom music so did please
That through her fiddling she lost all her geese,
Or of that orphan, fair as morning light,
Who went to fetch her geese at fall of night –
Would that some happy chance to them might bring
These books as simple as the songs they sing.

So at their country pleasures in my time
They sometimes read aloud beneath the lime
Justina's ballad or Wiesław's fable.
Meanwhile the bailiff dozing at the table,
The steward or the landlord deigned to hear,
And to the young folk made the hard things clear,
And praised the beauties and the faults would blame.

And young men envied then the singer's fame,
Which echoes in their woods and forests still,
To whom the laurel crown on Jove's high hill
Is less dear than the wreaths of cornflower blue,
Twined by the hands of village girls with rue.

Translated by Kenneth R. Mackenzie (London: Polska Fundacja Kulturalna/Polish Cultural Foundation, 1986), pages 3–6; 562–568 and 578–584.

ISTVÁN SZÉCHENYI: HUNNIA

Title: *Hunnia*

Originally published: Originally written in 1835, first published by János Török and printed in Pest by Gusztáv Heckenast in 1858

Language: Hungarian

The excerpts used are from the reprint: István Széchenyi, *Hunnia* (Budapest: Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó, 1985), pp. 5–11.

About the author

István Széchenyi [1791, Vienna – 1860, Döbling (Austria)]: politician and political writer. He was the scion of one of the most prestigious Catholic aristocratic families of the country. His father, Ferenc Széchényi, was famous for his cultural interests and founded the national library. As a young soldier István Széchenyi fought against Napoleon and led a bohemian life in the high society of Vienna. Later, he underwent a profound spiritual transformation and, influenced by his travels to England, he started to champion the modernization of the economy, society, and intellectual life of Hungary, initiating the foundation of the Academy of Sciences and the National Casino, proposing the regulation of rivers, building stone bridges, and introducing horse races. His political and economic essays stimulated the development of liberal political thinking in Hungary. In the 1840s he assumed a more conciliatory position towards Vienna, concentrating on socio-economic gains rather than on symbolic and constitutional issues. He also opposed Kossuth's assimilatory nationalism and became increasingly critical of the opposition movement, which was mostly based on the political culture of the country gentry. He accepted the Ministry of Transportation in the revolutionary government of Hungary (1848), but he resigned when the break with Austria seemed inevitable. Széchenyi suffered a mental breakdown in 1848 and spent the subsequent years in a sanatorium. In the 1850s he started to publish again, and grew increasingly critical of the Austrian 'neo-absolutist' regime. He committed suicide after a clash with the authorities following the publication of one of his pamphlets. Subsequently, he became 'canonized' as the 'Greatest Hungarian'—the symbol of Hungarian national awakening.

Main works: *Hitel* [Credit] (1830); *Világ* [Light] (1831); *Stádium* [Stadium] (1833); *Kelet népe* [People of the East] (1841); *Politikai programtöredékek* [Fragments of a political program] (1847); *Blick auf den anonymen Rückblick* [A look at an anonymous backward look] (1859).

Context

Széchenyi's political philosophy is based on the notion of the accumulative progress of civility characteristic of the British (and preeminently the Scottish) Enlightenment. He sees the road to national recovery as a process of 'polishing' the manners of the community. Civilization "conquers in due time even the most tyrannical power"; therefore, the task should be to create a specifically Hungarian form of civilization, otherwise social progress might affect "a deadly blow on our originality and peculiarity." In the 1830s and 1840s he formulated a program of enhancing communication through means both formal (such as credit institutions, and the development of infrastructure) and informal (casinos, horse races). Apart from the transformations in the socio-economic sphere, however, the notion of enhancing civility by the intensification of communication had another crucial aspect that represented a serious theoretical and also practical problem for the emerging liberal reformists. Obviously, this was the issue of the multi-ethnic composition of the territories of 'historical Hungary,' with over fifty percent of its inhabitants having a mother tongue other than Hungarian.

While his early writings (for example, 'Credit') dealt mainly with socio-economic issues, in *Hunnia* Széchenyi turned to the problem of nation-building, the national language, and the overall question of the nationalities. While the text was published only later and thus did not have an immediate impact, it is arguably Széchenyi's most compact argument concerning these issues. In this text he sought to make his audience conscious of the 'national aspect' of the country's backwardness. He asserted that the most immediate danger is the "fatal division" of the national community. But, according to him, the root of this division was not so much ethnic but rather socio-cultural, with the cosmopolitan aristocracy set against the uncultivated masses (characteristically, Széchenyi included the country-gentry in the second category). Hungarian public culture thus contained inorganic fragments of Western European culture removed from their context and mixed up with the self-complacent backwardness of the local tradition.

In his understanding, the closing of this gap and the development of a unified Hungarian national public is conditioned by the success of modernization. At the same time, the continuity of the pre-modern Hungarian political nation with the emerging modern nation does not exclude the other ethno-cultural communities from any kind of national existence. The Magyar character of his envisioned 'Hunnia' is a matter of *de facto* proportions of vested interests and not of some 'metaphysical' principle: the Magyars hold the

greatest estates, they make up the relatively largest community, they have a splendid past, a national fervor. Most importantly, they are 'alone': contrary to the other communities, which all have their kin-states outside of the realm of Saint Stephen, the destiny of the Magyars is intertwined by fate with the future of Hungarian statehood. Altogether, this vision of 'nation-building' aimed more at the non-privileged ethnic Hungarian component of the society than at the nationalities.

While Széchenyi's conceptions formed the master-narrative for the early wave of the reform movement, later he came to clash with the more radically disposed, gentry-based generation of politicians. One of the main points of conflict was precisely the nationality question. Reverting to a generally more conservative political vision, Széchenyi advocated a gradual and less assimilatory stance, whereas the liberal nationalists, led by **Lajos Kossuth**, inclined towards a French-type democratic nationhood, which would naturally attract all the "freedom-loving citizens" of the country to abandon their ethno-cultural allegiance in exchange for civic and socio-economic emancipation. In the early 1840s the divergence of opinions led to a lasting controversy between Széchenyi and Kossuth, and their clash became a paradigmatic focus of political self-positioning throughout modern Hungarian history.

In fact, practically every period has constructed its own image of Széchenyi, abstracted from the real complexities of his personality and political agenda. In the inter-war period he became the central figure of the official ideology of the authoritarian regime. This implied playing down the liberal elements of his thought and the accentuation of its conservative components, his moderate position on the question of assimilation being reinterpreted as an expression of ethno-centrism and a rejection of ethnic mixing. This reevaluation was mainly due to a very popular interpretation put forward by the conservative historian, **Gyula Szekfű**. While he lost his central position during the Communist regime (even though he was always part of the official Pantheon), the 1990s brought another wave in the Széchenyi cult, presenting him as symbol of both Europeanization and national self-assertion.

BT

Hunnia

The populations of Hungary speak many languages and profess many faiths. Tolerance breeds tolerance. And, thus, if the ruler of the Austrian Empire in his profound wisdom can do nothing better than not espousing any

denomination to the detriment of others, it likewise appears expedient to show a like tolerance by leaving the diverse peoples of Austria in peace to speak their languages and follow their customs freely.

Thus is it *understandable* that a non-Hungarian may not feel any particular liking towards the Hungarian language and has no mind to grant it supremacy over any others. But that a Hungarian should reject the Hungarian tongue is, in my understanding, unheard of amongst any of mankind. Impostors and traitors have lived in every age amidst every nation; but such a one who will cast aside all his national characteristics voluntarily and by his own choice, who will, abandoning his mother-tongue and forgetting everything that binds an honest man to his homeland, eradicate himself willingly from the ranks of patriots and stamp the seal of hybridity upon his forehead with his own hands – such a one, were you to traverse all the four climes of the globe, you could only find in the land of *Hunnia*. [...]

If the Hungarian nation is gradually melting away all by itself, and the greater intellectual weight of foreign countries resulting from their natural and characteristic traits is, instead of ennobling and improving her, constantly tormenting and eating away at her—what a mighty calamity this is by itself; and isn't it the curse of the vengeful heavens that like patricides, we ourselves should hasten and advance the perishing of our last treasure? What kind of partiality, what kind of mania can impel us to such an unnatural act? Do we perhaps fancy that foreigners will esteem us higher if we exhibit coldness and indifference towards our homeland and tread upon our nation? Do we fancy that they will raise high a man perfidious to his homeland, a traitor? Oh no! Let us be assured that those who praise our degeneration and hybridity merely want to deceive us and use us for their selfish goals. Just as we in our untainted youth cannot esteem anyone who is not a loyal son of his homeland, the untainted critic will hold us in no esteem if we do not respect our homeland; I said *in our untainted youth*; now how many of us have grown bitter and turned rancid by the hideousness of all the legal sophisms and selfish customs that we can encounter and experience day by day around us, and from whose venomous breath the greatest care can hardly save us.

Instead of a cordial harmony, which would allow the one to put up with the faults of the other and let them march forward with joint efforts, the Hungarian estates withdraw and turn their backs to each other, nurturing feelings of mutual enmity.

The one more sophisticated in foreign manners derides the generally clumsy or unpolished behavior of the native son. And indeed it is undeniable that amongst the privileged orders of Hungary there is such a great number of

unmannered, or rather ill-mannered fellows, or we should say *beings*—for never would a well-bred man want such a one to be his fellow—that perhaps no homeland can boast of a larger host of such persons. They are worse even than a caricature, because the latter heightens the most distinguishing features of its object, while there is hardly any distinguishing feature amidst this stupefied and brutish flock of our compatriots.

Those, however, who are more at home in Hungary have not the slightest regard for those superior qualities by virtue of which the others stand above them. And it is true that these superior qualities are most often restricted to a tiny grasp of French, some superficial command of English and the acquisition of slightly more refined manners abroad.

Now if I may ask, what, or rather who appears the more ridiculous in the eyes of the unbiased observer? The unsophisticated native Hungarian who, having abandoned his original crude but manly poise, and now neither at home in Hungarian nor in German, does not even know when to put on a coat and when to wear tails, when is the time for winter boots and when for shoes; who makes so many and such deep bows during a single visit as others during a whole year; who has no skill in riding, fencing, dancing, swimming or gymnastics at all; who, when meeting his like after one or two days' absence, exchanges kisses and slobbers to the point of nausea; who, if we take a closer look at matters of cleanliness, perhaps administers the least water to his body of all creations of God; who doesn't know where and how to turn to when in company, and thus, particularly in the presence of the fair sex, either stands taciturnly at the door out of excessive shyness, or perhaps excessive vanity, or seeks to appear original with his unbridled and roguish behaviour.

Is it this that is ridiculous, or the *Illustrissimus* and *Excellentissimus*, who doesn't understand his mother-tongue, or if he does, he doesn't teach it to his children and particularly to his daughters; he is never in his homeland, except for a visit to his estates to collect his income; he never under any circumstance contributes to the concerns of his homeland, he doesn't take the least part in public matters but finds his whole scope of activities, not like a Lucullus, for he lacks the required intellect for that, but like a Wallachian boyar, in keeping a better cook or a more lascivious courtesan!

Which of them, if I may ask, is a bitterer mockery of the patriot, of Man? [...]

We, the wretched privileged, have abandoned the crude but proud manliness of our ancestors. Nor would it become us now any more than a citadel upon the rocks or a fortress with swampy moats would become our present

shepherding way of life. But we have not yet acquired the better taste and those finer manners through which the qualities of both the spirit and the soul find expression to their utmost capacity; some of our representatives started to learn to swim last year, and some of their wives have been learning Hungarian since last year, etc. As for the members of the other House, even this much cannot be claimed. And thus we are caught between two kinds of existence, which is the most perilous situation for the fate of a nation. [...]

Translated by Dávid Oláh

LJUDEVIT GAJ: PROCLAMATIONS

Title: *Oglas* (Announcement) and *Proglas* (Proclamation)

Originally published: Zagreb, Ljudevit Gaj, 1834 and 1835

Language: Croatian

The excerpts used are from Dubravko Jelčić, ed., *Hrvatski književni romantizam* (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2002), pp. 155–159.

About the author

Ljudevit Gaj [1809, Krapina (Northern Croatia) – 1872, Zagreb]: language reformer, journalist and printer. Descendant of a middle-class German-Slovak family which settled in Croatia in the eighteenth century, he finished secondary school in Croatia and undertook university studies (in philosophy and law) in Vienna, Graz, Pest and Leipzig. In his first publication, ‘A short foundation of the Slavic-Croatian orthography’ (Buda, 1830), Gaj proposed a reformed phonetic orthography which became the basis of modern Croatian spelling. In 1834 he obtained royal privilege for publishing *Novine Horvatske* (The Croatian Newspaper), which reported the latest political events both abroad and in the Triune Kingdom, and for its literary supplement *Danica Horvatska, Slavonska i Dalmatinska* (The Croatian, Slavonian and Dalmatian Morning Star). The change of the titles to *Ilirske narodne novine* (The Illyrian National Newspaper) and *Danica ilirska* (The Illyrian Morning Star) in 1836 signaled the transformation of these journals into the official organs of the Illyrian Movement. In 1838 Gaj established his own printing press, which drove him into long-term financial indebtedness and the opportunistic search for different patrons, such as the Russian Tsar (1838), the Serbian Prince (1846), and the Austrian Emperor (1847). After the establishment in 1841 of the Croatian-Hungarian Party and the Illyrian (from 1843, the National) Party, Gaj helped to reconcile the endeavors of the Croatian conservatives and the Illyrians into a common anti-Magyar (anti-Kossuth) program. During the revolution of 1848 he presented the Croatian liberal ‘National demands’ to Ferdinand V in Vienna, but simultaneously kept contact with the revolutionary center at the University of Vienna. After the revolution he was appointed to the newly-founded Banal Council, participated in parliamentary life and focused on Croatian-Serbian relations. In 1849 he supported the imposed Olmütz Constitution and turned his newspaper into its official organ. During the period of Bach’s absolutism he was still regarded as politically unreliable and was subject to police surveillance because of his secret contacts with Serbia. After the restoration of

constitutionalism in 1860 he failed to enter again into political life and participated in the contemporary public sphere only sporadically. Despite the occasional contestation of his merits, Ljudevit Gaj, “the Father of Croatian orthography” and the initiator of the first Croatian newspaper, is regarded as the founder and one of the chief ideologists and political leaders of the Illyrian Movement, also known as the ‘Croatian National Revival.’

Main works: *Die Schlösser bei Krapina* [Castles near Krapina] (1826); *Kratka osnova horvatsko-slavenskoga pravopisanja* [A short foundation of Croatian-Slavic orthography] (1830); *Još Horvatska ni propala* [Croatia hasn’t perished yet] (1833); *Dogodovština Velike Ilirije* [A history of Great Illyria] (1846, remained in manuscript); *Gedanken zum Ausgleich Croatiens und Slavoniens mit der Regierung* [Thoughts on the compromise of Croatia and Slavonia with the government] (1864).

Context

During the Josephinian period the impact of the Enlightenment in the Kingdoms of Croatia and Slavonia and the Military Border was limited to school reforms and learned historiographical, literary and philological debates. The latter excluded the majority of the population from its communicative network because of their use of non-vernacular languages such as Latin and German. Still, in order to make the Enlightenment successful as a cultural process, a supra-local discursive network and an institutionalized public sphere had to be established, in which a weekly newspaper was regarded as a proper means for popular enlightenment. The earliest newspapers in the Croatian Kingdoms (launched in Zagreb) were entirely in Latin or German, and it was only in 1792 that the first request was submitted in Vienna for the launching of a Croatian newspaper, with both political news as well as entertaining moral and didactic articles. The project failed probably due to technical difficulties and to the unfavorable conjuncture of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, just as did two subsequent attempts in 1813 and 1818. All three newspapers were launched by commoners and were intended for the Croatian-speaking middle class. “Pleasure” and “utility” were to have been the twin criteria in the choice of appropriate articles. However, the Diet of 1825 in Pressburg (*Hun.* Pozsony, *Slo.* Prešporok, today Bratislava) and the proposal to introduce Hungarian as the official language into the Croatian administration and school system intensified the language debate, making it not only a cultural but also a political issue. Despite the existence of the German newspaper and journal in Zagreb, the Croatian reaction to the Magyar proposals stressed the need for an appropriate vernacular medium of communication. The crisis came to a head at the Diet at Pressburg in 1830, when knowledge of the Hungarian language became a statutory re-

quirement for the holding of public office and for practising law. In the same year the young law graduate Ljudevit Gaj offered a solution to the dilemmas of a common Croatian spelling, distinct from the Hungarian spelling used hitherto in writing the Croatian *kajkavian* dialect. Needless to say, the orthographic uncertainty was also hampering all journalistic and scholarly attempts to establish a broader discursive community. Finally in 1834 privilege was granted for launching *Novine Horvatske* and its literary supplement, *Danica Horvatska, Slavonska i Dalmatinska* ('Danica' was a reference to the six-pointed 'Morning Star'—an old iconographic topos in Illyrian ideology, which in Gaj's days symbolized the coming of day and the disappearance of darkness). The first issue came out in 1835.

Although learned debate on the standardization of the Croatian literary language had been going on ever since Humanism, it was only in the age of Romanticism that discussion was transferred from the 'Republic of Letters' to the broader public sphere. In the case of Croatia, just as in other regional contexts, the Romantic register with its organicist conception of the state and the nation was not limited merely to the cultural sphere, but brought changes in the patriotic, i.e. political discourse, as well. In the early 1830s the young Croatian jurists of the 'Zagreb Circle' re-conceptualized the notion of the civic community. Ivan Derkos (1808–1834), one of their spokesmen, in his pamphlet 'The spirit of the fatherland over its sleeping sons' (1832), argued in regard to the term 'fatherland' (*Lat. patria*) that apart from the 'common,' 'natural law-based' and 'positive law-based' meanings, a 'genealogical' one has been added, defined both as the race (*Lat. gens*) and the native soil where one is born or from which one descends. The Croatian 'fatherland' is thus equated in the Herderian sense with the broader 'Slavic nation,' which is understood organically as a living being or a natural unit having its own personality. Such a definition of patriotism put a great emphasis upon the cultivation and perfection of the mother tongue, the spirit of the nation, as a means for achieving the state of happiness, because the perfection of the language advances step by step with the cultivation of the nation itself. Moreover, the cultivation of the national language had been for the first time placed among Croatian municipal rights. A tension emerged in the meaning of 'nation', which the majority of the Croatian nobility still understood as a 'political nation,' which ranked them within the corporate Hungarian rather than the ethnically separate Croatian nation. In turn, this conceptualization created a dilemma about what language should be regarded as 'national', Magyar or Croatian? Due to the ambiguity of the term 'nation', which in the feudal system contained not only ethnic but also social connotations *par ex-*

cellence (e.g., exemption from taxation for the nobility), the newly established concept of “nationality” (*Cro.* *narodnost*) gained more and more importance, designating one people having its own national culture along with a national language. In order to overcome local patriotisms and cultural particularisms, the Croatian awakeners proposed a virtual reunification of the disintegrated Triune Kingdom (Croatia, Slavonia, and Dalmatia) in terms of their dialects, and the long-desired creation of a single literary language. The semantic limitations of the term ‘Croatian’, which in its *kajkavian* dialect could be applied only to three counties in Banal Croatia, and which evoked the notion of alliance with the Magyars (*Lat.* *Croata* = a privileged citizen of the Croatian Kingdoms, which were component parts of the composite Kingdom of Hungary), prompted Ljudevit Gaj to propose the term ‘Illyrian’ as a discursive construct which would encompass all South Slav dialects and broaden the basis for the new literature. ‘Harmony,’ ‘concord’ and ‘integration’ became the key words in this Illyrian (South Slavic) discourse.

In his programmatic proclamation of 1834, Gaj addresses the broader South Slavic linguistic community, or “the Slavic Nation in the southern parts,” as the potential public: primarily Croats, Serbs, Slovenians and Bosnians, and “other friends of this race and language.” The aim of *Danica* in 1834 was to publish various contributions, which would serve to provide matter “appropriately enlightening” and “pleasant” as well as “useful and instructive” not only in Croatian, but also in all other Illyrian dialects. The scope of possible topics included primarily literary and historical themes related generally to the “Slavic Nation” and the Croatian Kingdoms. A particular emphasis was to be put upon publishing the things worthy of imitation from the other “nations of enlightened and learned Europe.” The justification for the use of the national language is placed wholly within the European framework: the example of the European nations is invoked in regard to the progress of “the sciences and scholarship,” where it is conditioned by the use of the mother tongue. The collective “we” is identified as the brave “defenders and guardians” of the whole of Europe, armed and keeping guard throughout many centuries in the interest of the “regeneration of the whole of humankind.” Such discursive legitimization should justify the utilization of of the “Slavic mother-tongue,” which is spoken by 80 millions of “Slavic brothers.” The Romantic Pan-Slavic discourse that had been promoted by **Ján Kollár**, thematizing the redeeming role of Slavs in the history of humankind, is thus placed within the broader discourse of Europe. Within this broader framework, Gaj stresses ‘heroism’ as the peculiar Croatian (Illyrian)

cultural identity-trait among other Slavs, a topos since the time of Humanism.

Gaj's second programmatic proclamation of 1835 is marked by the clearly ideological transition to the Illyrian or South Slavic title of the newspaper and journal, and the adoption of the urban *štokavian* dialect as a standard, as well as a rupture with the name Croatian and its *kajkavian* literary tradition. Since Gaj wanted to address a broader South Slavic literary public, he preferred the neutral and inclusive supra-national historical name 'Illyrian' instead of the too narrow and exclusive 'Croatian,' and soon changed the titles of his publications into 'The Illyrian national newspaper' and 'The Illyrian Morning Star.' Gaj thereby adopts the old thesis of the autochthonous, congeneric and unitary Illyrians who once inhabited the Balkan area. In his concept of Illyria Gaj includes Montenegro and Bulgaria, which were left out from the catalogue in the first proclamation. In Gaj's geographical construct 'Illyria' is allegorically represented as a lyre on the lap of the young maiden Europe. Illyria, within the triangle of Shkodra (*Srb.* Skadar, in Albania), Varna and Villach, is thus the European lyre, and its loosened strings are the discordant South Slav countries which had once shared a common past but were later broken and dismembered by foreign conquerors. The Illyrians should become aware of their common past and start building through the medium of a literary language a national culture which would reflect this shared heritage. This 'Illyrian' language, however, was not to be based on a peasant vernacular dialect of *štokavian*, as in the case of the Serbian philologist **Vuk Stefanović Karadžić**, but rather on the refined urban *štokavian* of the former Republic of Dubrovnik. Unlike Karadžić, the Croatian Illyrians needed a broad scientific and political vocabulary which would suit the needs of a developed public life. Consequently, it was Karadžić who would be the main opponent of the Illyrian program among the Serbs, which he refuted as early as in 1836 by the text 'Serbs all and everywhere' (*Srbi svi i svuda*). There he radically rejects the name Illyrian, and extends his concept of Serbianness (one language-one nation) from "Trieste to the River Bojan" in Montenegro, thus renaming the Croatian, Slavonian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin nationalities as Serbs. Such ideological permeation of the language, which, by means of 'performative naming' (Bourdieu), ontologically changes the named object (in this case, nationalities), would be the cornerstone of future Croatian-Serbian linguistic clashes.

Gaj's proclamations were immediately canonized as the most important cultural manifestos of the Illyrian Movement, alias the Croatian National

Revival, until the creation of political parties in 1841. Their significance in the Croatian national canon has remained unimpaired ever since, despite debate as to why the peculiar Croatian ‘national awakening’ had to renounce its national name “Croatian” and unfold under the supranational name “Illyrian” instead.

TSB

Announcement (1834)

Illustrious and the Most Honourable Gentlemen of every Estate and Order of the celebrated Slavic nation of the southern parts, in other words: the Croats, the Slavonians, the Dalmatians, the citizens of Dubrovnik, the Serbs, the Carniolans, the Styrians, the Carinthians, the Istrians, the Bosnians and other Slavs, as well as other friends and patrons of our race and language, I salute you all!

With the highest permission of the Holy Emperor and King His Majesty FRANCIS I, from the beginning of the next year 1835 in Zagreb the national newspaper, divided into two separate parts, will be published under the title[s] *The Croatian Newspaper* [and] *The Croatian, Slavonian and Dalmatian Morning Star*.—Part one, or the so-called *The Croatian Newspaper*, will contain, in a more general manner, all the most recent political occurrences, that is to say, important changes in all the countries of the world, and, more specifically, all the special events and decrees in the country, or in other words, the most recent events in the Triune Kingdom of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia. And this part, containing clear explanations of all foreign words, will be published twice a week, each time in four pages. The other part, namely, *The Croatian, Slavonian and Dalmatian Morning Star*, published once a week in *The Croatian Newspaper* in four pages as a separate supplement, will not only be in Croatian, but also in various other Illyrian dialects. It will contain all sorts of entertaining and amusing issues, not only appropriately enlightening and pleasant, but also useful and instructive. [This includes] general knowledge about our Slavic nation that should especially be remembered: from its history and events, from its written records and books. In short, everything about the Croats and their Illyrian brothers, from the ancient to the current estate of all Slavic people, that is worth studying and knowing. Our newspaper will write in the most careful manner about matters in our dear Triune Fatherland taken from appropriate sources. That is, stories of ancient Illyrian and Croatian life and everyday existence, about

their county magistrates, princes, viceroys, kings and knights, as well as learned and famous men. [It will also include] discussions about previous systems of government, about the fortunes and misfortunes of our ancestors, about our ancient towns, settlements, important places and ancient tribes. Various folk and other patriotic poems will be attached thereto; especially poems reflecting domestic affairs, as well as valuable poems from other languages.

We shall make a special effort to mention noble and important matters of benefit, which set an example and should be appropriated from other nations of enlightened and learned Europe – namely, events relevant to domestic and foreign governance.

Almost all European nations have progressed so far in science and scholarship that they publish books and newspapers in the mother tongue that are not only read at the courts of the mighty, but are also read and respected in common households. Is it not, then, high time that we, like our famous ancestors, the defenders and guardians of the whole of Europe who always kept guard courageously and under arms for so many centuries in the interest of the regeneration of the whole humankind, that we, I reiterate, also speed our efforts to enlighten and, in a worthy manner, take pride in our dear Slavic mother tongue, which exults in an abundant vocabulary and delightful pronunciation, and which represents our natural link to eighty millions of our Slavic brothers?

There is no better way to achieve this noble goal faster than with the help of a national newspaper which has been rendered possible by *the true fatherly mercy of our Holy Emperor and King and His confidence invested in us*; because in one and the same *Morning Star*, the political segment covering recent events from around the world, and various pleasant and useful doings of Croatian-Slavic patriots, will be intertwined in a single garland in a manner which, we venture to say, will enable our national newspaper to compensate adequately for the unfortunate lack of patriotic books, as much as this is possible.

Hence, we place patriotically our intention discussed here in brief, which we plan to achieve with the assistance of numerous learned men, in the dear embrace of true patriots and the rest of mankind, and of the friends of our nation and fatherland. [...]

Zagreb, 20 October 1834

Proclamation (1835)

Europe appears like a seated maiden, and a mere glance at this image reveals that the maiden is holding a three-cornered *lyre* pressed to her breasts. Far back in the past, this *lyre* used to produce the most pleasurable authentic sound when soothing winds made its still harmonious strings vibrate.—But a strong wind from the south and the west arose suddenly, followed by the violent bora¹ from the east and the north; the strings were loosened and harmony of the precious sounds was gone.

This *lyre* of Europe is *Illyria* stretching in the triangle between Shkodra, Varna and Belak.² The loosened discordant strings of this lyre are: *Carinthia, Gorizia, Istria, Carniola, Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia, Dubrovnik, Bosnia, Montenegro, Bulgaria and Lower Hungary*.—Now that everyone longs for unity, the best thing to do is to wish that all discordant strings of the European lyre become in tune again, so that the delights of their calming sounds can celebrate the eternal youth of this seated maiden. Can we even start thinking about achieving this great goal when every string is trying to be in accord with a foreign tune?—Let us stop plucking our individual strings, let us reassemble the *lyre* into a single harmony, because there is only one lyre, though each of its strings has shifted to some extent from its authentic natural sound.—Let us open the ancient book of our nation that holds the former dear sounds of the *lyre* that have sprung from the Slavic spirit, and let us reconstruct therefrom the harmony of the beloved *lyre* of Europe, *Illyria*.—Those who understand the truth and reason of this simile, will inevitably become aware and convinced of the necessity to create a uniform scholarly and literary language. [...]

[...] Since our national newspapers are to be written in the spirit of the above simile for all brothers of *Great Illyria*, we intend to replace all special or particular titles not reflecting true patriotic love and unity with our ancient and famous historical and universal name. Therefore, from the beginning of the year 1836, our newspaper, the basis of which remains the same, will no longer be published under the particular title of *The Croatian Newspaper*, but under a more generic name common to all South Slavs:

The Illyrian National Newspaper. [...]

Translated by Iva Polak

¹ A strong and cold northerly wind on the Adriatic Sea.

² Ger. Villach, in Austria.

ILIJA GARAŠANIN: THE DRAFT

Title: *Načertanije* (The Draft)

Originally published: The text, commonly known as the *Načertanije*, was written in 1844 but for long kept in secrecy; it was first published in 1906, as “Program spoljne politike Ilije Garašanina na koncu 1844. godine,” (The foreign policy program of Ilija Garašanin at the end of 1844), ed. by Milenko Vukićević, in: *Delo*, vol. 38, No.1, 1906, pp. 321–336

Language: Serbian

The excerpts are from a transcript of the original text published in Radoš Ljušić, *Knjiga o Načertaniju*, (Beograd: Beogradski izdavačko-grafički zavod, 1993), pp. 151–166. An English translation is also available in P. N. Hehn, “The Origins of Modern Pan-Serbianism – The 1844 Nacer-tanije of Ilija Garasanin: An Analysis and Translation,” *East European Quarterly*, 1975, IX (2), pp. 153–171.

About the author

Ilija Garašanin [1812, Garaši (Central Serbia) – 1874, Belgrade]: politician. He was born into a merchant family. His original family name was Savić, but he took the name Garašanin after his native village. He opted for a military career during the reign of Miloš Obrenović (r. 1817–1839, 1858–1860). His father and brother were politically engaged on the side of the so-called *Ustavobranitelji* (Constitutionalists). Garašanin, too, entered politics and was among those prominent politicians expelled from Serbia in 1840 after Mihajlo Obrenović (r. 1840–1842 and 1860–1868) came to power. After appealing for protection to the Ottoman authorities in Belgrade, some of the exiles were sent to Vidin (present-day Bulgaria) and others, including members of the Garašanin family, were directed to Istanbul. Under pressure from the Ottomans, Austrians and Russians, Prince Mihajlo and the ‘Constitutionalists’ made peace, and the majority of the émigrés, Ilija Garašanin among them, returned to Serbia at the end of 1841. The Constitutionalists actively participated in overthrowing Mihajlo Obrenović and establishing the rival Karađorđević dynasty in 1842. The regime which they subsequently established was marked by the almost complete dominance of a state bureaucratic oligarchy in which Ilija Garašanin played a key role, first as Minister of the Interior from 1843 until 1852 and later as President of the State Council (the Serbian government) and Minister of Foreign Affairs. However, he was dismissed from the position in 1853

at the request of the Russians who considered his policy to be pro-French. After several dynastic conflicts, Prince Mihajlo Obrenović appointed him Prime Minister in 1861. In the following years Garašanin worked on the solidification of the regime of the ruling dynasty inside the country. In foreign policy he followed the strategic lines laid down in his *Načertanije* and accommodating the anti-Ottoman intrigues of the ambitious prince. Because of his opposition to the prince's marriage plans he was dismissed from his position and left politics. He died in Belgrade in 1874.

Context

Načertanije represents the carefully elaborated draft of a Serbian foreign policy program. It consists of an introductory part followed by two chapters entitled 'The policy of Serbia' and 'Which means could be used to achieve the goal of Serbian policy?' The Introduction and the first part represent the core of the document where the basic ideas about the future expansion of the Serbian state are presented. In the latter part of the document, basic ideas about the Serbian propaganda policy are outlined.

Načertanije is the first written national program in Serbia. It was kept secret until 1888 when it was for the first time publicly referred to, in Milan Đ. Milićević's book *Pomenik znamenitih ljudi u srpskog naroda novijeg doba* (Album of the important figures among the Serbs in modern times). Milićević claimed that Garašanin's policy in office was guided by the ideas presented in the *Načertanije*, even though the existence of such a document was at that time known only to a few and it remained unpublished until 1906. From the moment of its publication, this document has been the focus of scholarly and political interest, provoking controversy and rival interpretations. It is certainly one of the most contested documents of nineteenth-century Serbian history.

In spite of opposing interpretations as to the political goals embodied in this document, historians agree on one fundamental point: that *Načertanije* represents the basic programmatic political document of nineteenth-century Serbian history. It was written at a time shortly following the restoration of some political stability after more than a decade of internal strife: the state-bureaucratic class, flaunting themselves as defenders of the constitution (hence "Constitutionalists"), among them Ilija Garašanin, had finally triumphed over the prince and in 1842 established themselves firmly at the head of the young state.

In international terms, however, the Principality found itself in constantly troubled waters. After the Polish 'November Uprising' (1830–31) was crushed by Russian troops, some of the Polish revolutionaries moved to Ser-

bia, where they built contacts with the Constitutionals. Garašanin was well informed about the activities of the Polish émigrés in Serbia and engaged in a correspondence with them. The basis of *Načertanije* was the project of the Polish émigré Prince Adam Czartoryski, and it was actually formulated by František Zach, a Czech who came to Serbia in November 1842 to take up a position in the state bureaucracy. He presented his plan for regional politics to Garašanin in December 1843. In line with the strategic ideas of the Polish émigrés, Zach's plan called for the unification by Serbia of the South Slav lands (Croatia-Slavonia, Dalmatia, Bulgaria, Bosnia and Hercegovina, and the Slovenian lands), thus creating a basis for Serbian resistance to both Russian and Austrian influence. In his revision of Zach's plan, Garašanin envisioned a reconstruction of the medieval Serbian empire and the unification of the 'Serbian lands' (Bosnia and Hercegovina, Montenegro, northern Albania, parts of Dalmatia and the Habsburg Military Border). Union with the other South Slavs (the Croatians and Bulgarians) was planned under the Serbian dynasty. The foreign policy plans of the document clearly reflected its 'Polish' origins, seeking to maintain a balance among the Great Powers and freeing Serbia from Austrian influence. The document also had a practical side inasmuch as it called for the creation of a network of agents in all South Slavic lands working to free Serbia from Austrian influence.

The basic idea presented in *Načertanije* was the liberation and unification of South-Slavic (*južnoslovenske*) lands, with Serbia playing the role of a 'Piedmont' for the South Slavs. What Garašanin actually meant was the unification of the "southern Serbs" and (what later became) Northern Bulgaria—that is, the 'Ottoman Slavs'—whereas his position was more ambiguous concerning the Habsburg Serbs. In fact, in the first part of the document he made clear that the plan referred to the Serbs inhabiting the Ottoman lands, while in the second part of the plan he mentioned the Serbs of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia as well. Speaking of these, he emphasized the importance of propagating the ideas of national unification among the Habsburg Serbs in general, but he did not put forward the idea of a broader national unification that would have encompassed the Serbs both in the Ottoman and the Habsburg lands. In this way, while Garašanin cultivated in the first instance the idea of a "Greater Serbia," he also left space for a possible wider integration with other South Slav nations (Croatians, Bulgarians) and the creation of a South-Slav state.

The critical reception of *Načertanije* focuses on two points. The first relates to the discussions about the ideological influences on *Načertanije*, that is, the debates concerning the authorship of the document. Some have em-

phasized the impact that Czartoryski's ideas had on Garašanin, hence the genuinely Serbian character of the document has been questioned. Others have stressed exactly the opposite—the authenticity, or *Serbianness* of the document—and credited Garašanin with inventing its main ideas. The second point of contention is related to the question about the political implications of the plan: more precisely, was it directed towards the creation of a Yugoslav or a (Greater) Serbian state? Interwar historians such as Đurađ Jelenić, Ferdo Šišić, Dragoslav Stranjaković, and some Marxist historians after 1945, for example Ljiljana Aleksić, interpreted *Načertanije* as a document infused with the concept of a Yugoslav unity. Vasa Čubrilović was the first among another group of Marxist historians who during the 1950s pointed to the document's nationalistic (*velikosrpski*) character, an interpretation later elaborated by other historians, mainly from Croatia, especially during the 1990s (Mirko Valentić, Nikša Stančić, Ivo Banac). The latter interpretation has been invariably maintained by Bulgarian historiography as well.

IE

The Draft

*[A plan of Serbia's foreign and national policies
at the end of the year 1844]*

Serbia must come into line with the rest of European countries, having drawn up *a plan for her own future*, or putting together, so to speak, a sort of domestic policy defining the main guiding principles to which Serbia should constantly adhere at various times and according to which she should conduct her affairs in a consistent manner.

Tumult among the Slavs has already begun and it will indeed never cease. Serbia must learn to understand this movement very thoroughly, as well as the role or task which she will have to perform within the said movement.

If Serbia considers thoroughly what she is at the moment, what her position is and what the nature of the nations surrounding her is, she will invariably arrive at the conclusion that she is still very small, and that she cannot remain thus. Only in alliance with her neighboring nations can she ensure a future for herself; and this must be her sole task.

The main line and fundament of Serbian politics arises from this notion [that she should not limit herself to her current boundaries, but that she should strive to encompass all the Serbian peoples that surround her.]

Should Serbia fail to adhere to this policy closely [and, even worse, should she reject it] and should she not draw up a well thought-out plan for this purpose, she shall find herself tossed around by foreign tempests like a tiny vessel, until she eventually hits a large rock, against which she will shatter into smithereens.

What we wish and are attempting to achieve through this plan is to offer a contribution to Serbian policy.

The policy of Serbia

The Turkish Empire [must] fall apart, and this dissolution can only take place in two ways:

1. Either the Empire will be divided, or
2. It will be built anew by its Christian inhabitants.

[...]

The Serbian state, which has already taken off favorably, but which needs to expand and become stronger, has its strong base and foundation in the Serbian kingdom of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and in the rich and glorious Serbian history. [It is known from history that] Serbian kings had begun taking over the momentum of the Greek Empire and would nearly have put an end to it, thus substituting a Serbo-Slavic Empire for the fallen Eastern Roman Empire. Emperor Dušan the Mighty¹ had already adopted the coat-of-arms of the Greek Empire. The arrival of the Turks interrupted this changeover and obstructed this matter for a long time, but now that Turkish strength has been, in a manner of speaking, broken down and destroyed, that same spirit ought to reawaken and assert its rights anew and once again continue the interrupted process.

This foundation and the bases of the construction of the Serbian Empire ought now to be cleaned of ruins and debris and be brought to light; and thus a new building should commence and continue on such a firm and permanent historical fundament. This is how this undertaking will attain an inexpressible importance and high value in the eyes of all nations and their very cabinets; as we Serbs would then be presenting ourselves to the world as the real

¹ Stefan Dušan (r. 1333–1355), the greatest Serbian ruler of the Middle Ages.

heirs of our great forefathers, who are but repeating their glorious achievements. Therefore, our present will not be without a link to our past, but the two will comprise an inter-dependent, homogeneous and organized whole. This is why the Serbian nation, its ethnicity and its statehood stand protected by a sacred historical right. Our longing cannot be dismissed as new and ungrounded, as being a revolution or a coup, but must be acknowledged by everyone as politically necessary, grounded in ancient times and as having its root in the former state and national life of the Serbs—a root which is merely starting to grow new branches and is starting to thrive again.

If this new revival of the Serbian Empire is seen from this perspective, then other South Slavs will easily understand this idea and will adopt it with pleasure. For the memory of the historical past probably survives in no European nation in such a way as it does with the Slavs of Turkey, who even to the present day retain a vivid and faithful recollection of almost all glorious men and events of their history. This is why we can count on with certainty that this undertaking will be willingly accepted by the people, and there is no need for decades of agitation among the nation for people to realize what the benefit and usefulness of this self-governance is.

Serbians were the first of all Slavs in Turkey to fight for their freedom with their own means and strength, and, therefore, they have primary and full entitlement to resume this struggle. Even now, in many places and in certain cabinets, it is being foreseen and predicted that the Serbs are looking at a glorious future, which is what is attracting the attention of all Europe toward Serbia. If we did not think beyond the principality as it now is, and if we did not perceive this principality as the germ of a future Serbian Empire, then the interest of the world would rest upon Serbia no longer than was the case with the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, in which there is no independent principle of life and which are consequently considered to be mere appendages of Russia.

A new Serbian state in the South would give Europe every guarantee that it would be a worthy and sound state, able to survive between Austria and Russia. The country's geographical position, its surface, its abundance of natural resources and the courageous spirit of its inhabitants, as well as an elevated and fiery feeling of nationhood, a common origin, a shared tongue—all of these point to its permanence and great future. [...]

Translated by Vedran Dronjić

IOANNIS KOLETTIS: OF THIS GREAT IDEA

Title: *Τῆς Μεγάλης αὐτῆς Ἰδέας* (Of this Great Idea)

Originally published: It was published in *Ἡ τῆς τρίτης Σεπτεμβρίου ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἐθνικὴ Συνέλευσις*, Athens, Βουλὴ τῶν Ελλήνων, 1844

Language: Greek

The excerpts used are from Constantinos Th. Dimaras, *Ελληνικὸς Ρωμαντισμός* (Athens: Ερμῆς, 1985), pp. 405–406.

About the author

Ioannis Kolettis [1773, Sirako (Epirus) – 1847, Athens]: medical doctor, politician and writer. He was educated in his hometown of Sirako and in nearby Kalarites, both prosperous towns in eastern Epirus. He then moved to Jannina, the commercial and educational center of the region, where he became involved in trade. From there, in 1800, he traveled to Pisa, where he studied medicine and came into contact with Bonapartist circles. In 1807 he returned to Jannina, where he was appointed as doctor in the service of Muhtar Pasha, the son of Ali Pasha of Tepelen. After Ali Pasha's defeat by the Ottoman forces and his execution in 1822, Kolettis found refuge in his hometown. During the Greek War of Independence he tried, unsuccessfully, to instigate an uprising there. He then escaped to the Morea (Peloponnese). There, thanks to his education and his political abilities he was soon appointed to the administration, and he served in it throughout the war and then under the first governor Capodistrias and the Regency. As soon as King Otto took over in 1835, Kolettis was sent to Paris, where he served as ambassador, a post he was assigned to in order to keep him away from Athens. During these years, Kolettis came into contact with the political elite of the French capital, for whom he symbolized the warrior-hero of the Revolution, a profile he systematically cultivated. However, with the constitutional movement in 1843 he returned to Greece, where he was appointed prime minister, a position he retained until his death in 1847. During this turbulent period, he managed to monopolize power. Notoriously crafty, he convinced different groups that he was promoting their interests. Above all, he enjoyed the devotion of the Rumeliote *παληκάρια* (brave young men), whom he used in campaigns of political terrorism. Kolettis is considered the first important politician of the Hellenic state, who skillfully managed to survive in the harsh conditions of the aftermath of the War of Independence by using violence and personal coalitions regardless of ideology. Though he championed universal values, in his political activity he implemented a nationalist discourse which bore little relation to these values.

Context

During the Greek War of Independence, uprisings broke out in many regions of the Balkans. However, most of them were eventually suppressed and the revolutionary movement managed to hold out only in the Peloponnese and Central Greece. Therefore, after the foundation of the Hellenic state in 1830, only these regions were included within its boundaries. From the Greek point of view, despite the miserable conditions in the newly born state, its boundaries were considered temporary. From the enthronement of the first king of Greece, the Bavarian Prince Otto (r. 1832–1862), until the defeat in the Greek-Turkish War of 1919–1922 and the compulsory exchange of populations, under different circumstances and in several forms the redemption of their ‘enslaved’ brothers had been the predominant ideology of Greek politics.

However, in 1843 the king had to deal with a domestic crisis. On 3 September, the veterans of the War of Independence, who had been completely marginalized by the new regime, together with their military officers who could not bear being subject to Bavarian commanders, handed an ultimatum to the king. Their major claim was that Otto should not reign uncontrolled. Therefore, they demanded that a National Assembly was to be convened in order to provide the country with a constitution. The king had no alternative but to accept their demands and proclaim the opening of the Assembly. Many political and military figures now made a glorious return. Among them, Ioannis Kolettis, for years ‘exiled’ in Paris, was called back to take over as the leader of the ‘French party.’ These parties had existed as early as the revolutionary period, the French, the English and the Russian parties being connected to the corresponding Great Powers. However, during the period of Otto’s absolutist rule they had remained in the shadows. Now, under the new circumstances, they resumed their activity.

Within this political and ideological atmosphere, on 14 January 1844, the National Assembly debated the articles of the new constitution. One of the most important issues at stake was the third article, which defined Hellenic citizenship. A few days earlier, a new element was introduced into the debate when certain deputies proposed the stipulation of a distinction between native—*autochthones*—and immigrant—*heterochthones*—Greeks. Under the nationalist rhetoric the debate had a strongly social character. When the Hellenic state was founded in 1830, most of the offices in public administration were occupied by *heterochthones*—mainly Phanariots, but also individuals who came from Western Europe. As early as 1844 the University of Athens,

which had been founded in 1837, produced its first graduates. These young professionals strongly opposed the right of immigrants to occupy public office.

In his speech, Kolettis, relying on historical arguments, demonstrated the duty of liberated Hellenes to fight for the liberation of all Greek lands. This constituted the 'Great Idea'—*Megali Idea*—of the Hellenic race. Greece was considered to be the center of Europe. It did not belong either to the West or to the East, which allowed it to be Western and Eastern at the same time, a *topos* which would be the source of many ensuing cultural and political projects. In the past, Greece had enlightened the West, and now it was destined through its rebirth to offer its light to the East. In order to achieve this purpose, the Hellenes had to be united in one state, one religion, one cause and one constitution. The symbolic focus of the nation's permanent mental mobilization should be the city that captured the imagination of all Balkan nations, the capital of two empires, Constantinople. Thus, this discourse, apart from an articulation of territorial irredentism, constituted the political equivalent of a prophecy. Interestingly, even though Constantinople occupied a central place as a political reference, Byzantium as a historical and cultural discourse had not yet acquired its dominant place in the Greek historical imaginary and the Byzantine period had not yet been efficiently integrated to the national historiographical canon. This would be the task of Kolettis' protégé, the historian **Constantinos Paparrigopoulos**. Despite its obviously opportunistic character, Kolettis' speech managed to encapsulate the concerns and the dreams of a newly established state searching for a vision. With his rhetorical ability he appealed to the patriotic feelings of his audience, reminding them of the oath taken in 1821 when all Greeks rose against Ottoman rule.

In the event, a distinction between *autochthones* and *heterochthones* was adopted. Nevertheless, Kolettis' speech had an enormous impact, which might be related to the fact that the term 'Great Idea' was already in use. The poet Alexandros Soutzos in the political drama *Ὁ πρωθυπουργός καὶ ὁ ἀτίθασος ποιητής* (The prime minister and the defiant poet), published in 1843, used nearly the same phrasing. As a matter of fact, it was not clear what exactly Kolettis meant when coining the new term. This very fact facilitated the transformations in the content of the 'Great Idea' that were to follow. During the Crimean War, the 'Great Idea' was connected with the prospect of the creation of a Greek Empire, combining Hellenic antiquity with the Byzantine monarchy. Upon the arrival of King George I in 1864, however, official policy shifted towards domestic development and friendly relations with the Ottoman Empire. The very concept of the 'Great Idea' was eventually chal-

lenged by the 'enslaved' brothers themselves. After the reforms of 1839–1856, known as *Tanzimat*, and the new opportunities opening up for the non-Muslim communities of the Ottoman Empire, the flourishing Greek-Orthodox elites of Constantinople and Smyrna (İzmir, present-day Turkey) in particular promoted the policy of *Ελληνο-οθωμανισμός* (Helleno-Ottomanism), which sought to assure friendly relations between the two states and condemned the expansionism of the Hellenic state. However, following the Berlin Congress in 1878, support for the 'Great Idea' was renewed and eventually led to the Greek triumph in the Balkan Wars of 1912–13 and, with the Treaty of Sèvres, the creation of a 'Greater Greece.' The occupation of a large district around Smyrna by the Greek army in 1919 and the launching of the Asia Minor campaign created the impression that the nation was close to achieving its dream and would proceed to liberate all unredeemed populations. The disaster of 1922 and the departure of a total of 1,200,000 Orthodox Greeks from Asia Minor and Thrace, during the period 1914–1922, marked the tragic end of this ambitious dream.

VK

Of this Great Idea

[...]

I shudder when I think back to that day on which we swore to give everything, even our very lives, for the freedom of Greece. Many of those who took that oath are still alive. How deeply we should feel the weight of this oath on this occasion, when we have assembled to draw up the Constitution, this gospel of our political existence, in order that, from now on, we shall have two gospels, one of our religious and one of our political existence. Due to its geographical location, Greece is the center of Europe; positioned thus, and having to its right the East, and to its left the West, it has been destined, on the one hand, by falling, to enlighten the West and, on the other, by being reborn, to enlighten the East. The former was accomplished by our forefathers, while the latter has been assigned to us; it is in the spirit of this oath and of this 'Great Idea' that I have always seen the plenipotentiaries of the nation assemble in order to decide no longer about the fate of Greece, but of the Hellenic race. How I wish I were today in the presence of Germanos, Zaimis, Kolokotronis,¹ the National Assembly plenipotentiaries of the past,

¹ Paleon Patron Germanos, Andreas Zaimis and Theodoros Kolokotronis were heroes of the Greek War of Independence.

and those who took up arms for this cause, in order for them to agree with me as to how we have distanced ourselves from that idea of a Motherland which we first saw expressed in the song by Rigas. United then, in one spirit, those of us who bore the name Hellenes, conquered a part of the whole cause. [...]

The Kingdom of Greece is not Greece. It constitutes only one part, the smallest and feeblest. The name Hellenes describes not only those who live in this kingdom, but also those who live in Jannina, in Thessaloniki, in Serres, in Adrianople, in Constantinople, in Trebizond, in Crete, in Samos and in any territory associated with Hellenic history and the Hellenic race. [...] There are two prime cores of Hellenism: Athens, the capital of the Hellenic Kingdom, and the City (Constantinople), the vision and hope of all Hellenes. [...]

And, of course, you have the same belief, and the same wish, because each of you has in himself the idea of his glorious Hellenic origin; every one of you feels that this Assembly was held in Athens, the glory, grandeur and inimitable monuments of which have been admired for centuries, and will continue to be admired. Athens and the whole of Greece, divided in ancient times in separate states, fell, and having fallen enlightened the world. What hope is offered today by Greece, reborn and united in one State, in one cause, and one force, in one religion, and, lastly, in one constitution, which we are now bringing about?

Translated by Mary Kitroeff

KAREL HAVLÍČEK BOROVSKÝ: THE SLAV AND THE CZECH

Title: *Slovan a Čech* (The Slav and the Czech)

Originally published: First published in *Pražské noviny*, 15 February–12 March 1846

Language: Czech

Excerpts used are from 'The Danger of Pan-Slavism', in Hans Kohn, ed., *Nationalism: Its Meaning and History* (London and New York: Nostrand Reinhold, 1965), pp. 155–59. Originally published in Hans Kohn, *The Mind of Modern Russia* (New Brunswick, N.J. Rutgers University Press, 1955), pp. 83–90.

About the author

Karel Havlíček Borovský [1821, Borová near Příbyslav (*Ger.* Primislaw, eastern Bohemia) – 1856, Prague]: journalist, writer and politician. Havlíček was born to a Roman Catholic merchant family. He studied philosophy at Prague where he became acquainted with Czech nationalism and Pan-Slav ideas. He entered the seminary but was expelled in 1841. He left Prague, moving first to Upper Hungary and Galicia and later to Russia, where he was engaged as a tutor in the family of the Russian Slavophile historian S. P. Shevyriov. During his stay in Moscow he was cured of his Pan-Slav fantasies, as is clearly apparent in his stories 'Scenes from Russia.' After his return to Prague he became acquainted with **František Palacký**, who appointed him as the editor-in-chief of the only Czech daily, *Pražské noviny* (Prague News) in 1846. In 1848 Havlíček became involved in the political activities of the Czech liberals as a member of the National Committee and as a deputy to the Imperial Diet. He defended the existence of the Austrian state, though he advocated its transformation into a constitutional monarchy and federation. To promote this purpose he founded his own *Národní noviny* (National news) in April 1848, which became the most influential Czech daily in the revolutionary years. At the same time, he was critical towards the radical democrats, whom he held responsible for the Prague May uprising that hindered the convocation of the country's Diet, the main aim of the liberals. After the dissolution of the Kremsier Diet, Havlíček's newspapers turned against the government and were banned in 1850. He moved to Kutná Hora, where he started to publish a weekly *Slovan* (The Slav) that was banned a year later. In December 1851 Havlíček was arrested and sent to internal exile in the Tyrolean town of Brixen (*It.* Bressanone). Released in 1855, he died a year later of tuberculosis. He soon became an icon of Czech national martyrdom. Besides journalism, Havlíček

wrote satirical epic poems and epigrams that were published only after 1861 and that became part of the Czech literary canon. Nowadays, Havlíček is perceived as the founder of modern political journalism in Bohemia and as one of the most original Czech liberal thinkers.

Main works: *Obrázky z Rus* [Scenes from Russia] (1843–1846); *Duch Národních novin* [The spirit of the National News] (1851); *Epistolky kutnohorské* [Letters from Kutná Hora] (1851); *Křest sv. Vladimíra* [The baptism of St Vladimir] (1861, 1867); *Tyrolské elegie* [Tyrolean elegies] (1861); *Král Lávra* [King Lávra] (1870).

Context

The ‘Slav idea’ was present from the very beginning of the modern Czech national movement, but its content changed in the course of time. After the scholarly interest of **Josef Dobrovský** at the turn of the nineteenth century, **Ján Kollár**’s cultural concept of a Slav nation predominated in the first decades of the nineteenth century (see **Ján Kollár**, *The Daughter of Sláva*). Although not every patriot who wanted to revive the Czech language was a devotee of ‘Slav reciprocity’, Kollár’s idea became generally accepted. In the period of the political differentiation among the Czech bourgeoisie (during the 1830s and 1840s), however, and as a result of the Russian suppression of and repercussions after the 1830/31 Polish uprising, this vague Kollárian Pan-Slavism was challenged.

With Havlíček’s ‘The Slav and the Czech’, the Austro-Slav idea made its first appearance in Czech political thought. After his disillusionment with political life and social reality in the Russian monarchy, Havlíček came to the conclusion that Czech Pan-Slavism was just a dangerous dream brought about by fear of German predominance rather than a recognition of real political possibilities. The essence of his thinking was the belief that a strong Austrian state, once it had carried out substantial political and social reforms, would offer the only chance for the Slav and other small nations in Central Europe to live in freedom and cultural independence. The Austro-Slav approach did not neglect the possibility of ‘Slav reciprocity’ but stressed that it had a purely cultural role and rejected all visions of the unity of Slavs, especially under Russian rule. At the same time, this position was intended as a guard against the increasingly powerful ‘Greater German’ movement, which considered Bohemia part of the German lands. The political statement of the Austro-Slav idea appeared in the ‘Manifesto of the First Slav Congress to all nations of Europe’ of 12 June 1848, the main author of which was **František Palacký**.

In ‘The Slav and the Czech’, Havlíček rejected the notion of ‘Slav’ as a term describing one nation. Instead, the term was to be used as an ‘ethno-

graphic category,' similar to Germanic or Romanic ethnic and/or linguistic groups. Havlíček deplored the Russian-Polish hostility, which was, according to him, rooted mainly in Tsarist absolutism and the egoism of the Polish nobility. His thinking about Slav politics was based on his strong liberal democratic convictions. For him, self-preservation was the most important force of human action—both of individuals and nations. If, then, nations were to live in peace, they must find common interests and derive mutual profit from their collaboration. This was, according to Havlíček, hardly achievable among all Slavic nations; Czechs, however, had much in common with the 'Illyrians', because they both lived in the Austrian state.

With the publishing of Havlíček's article and other Austro-Slav pronouncements, Kollár's ideas were challenged but did not lose all their adherents. Havlíček's article provoked many hostile reactions among Czech conservative patriots and Slavophiles. Indeed, Pan-Slavic ideas, with their characteristic pro-Russian stance, re-appeared in Czech politics from time to time. They did not, however, have any particularly strong effect. Austro-Slavism was politically much more influential, and, together with the ideas of federalism, it formed a firm basis for the most important Czech political programs (especially those of Palacký and, later, **Tomáš G. Masaryk**) until the outbreak of the world war in 1914.

MK

The Slav and the Czech

Simultaneously with the awakening of the national spirit and some higher activities in our 'Austrian-Czech' fatherland, there came also the Slav idea, or rather this idea made itself felt again, but this time with a great strength and greater hope than before. As often happens, the Slav idea, like all other great and new ideas, became fashionable with us, so that some years ago almost everybody called himself a Slav, ashamed, as it were, of something as small as our Czech, Moravian, Silesian, or Slovak. Everybody called the Russians, Poles, Illyrians, and other Slavs his brothers, and was concerned for their well-being at least as much as for the growth of his own nation; and those who were the most practical ones felt in their heart the firm conviction that as time went on all eighty million (and all the other millions who meanwhile would accrue) would have in common one literary language, the same sympathies and all the other matters, which it is presently not advisable to discuss; in short that they all would become a single nation in the same sense in which the French and others were single nations. [...]

The purpose of this article is to correct these errors as far as possible in the minds of my countrymen, to remove the harmful, and thereby to strengthen the useful aspects of the Slav idea. I consider that my words will become more acceptable if I prove them from my own life experience: if we wish to combat prejudices we can do it best if we acknowledge that we shared them formerly. One always believes an experienced man more.

I learned to know Poland and I did not like it. With a feeling of hostility and pride I left the Sarmatian country, and in the worst cold season I arrived in a sleigh in Moscow, being warmed mostly by the Slav feeling in my heart. The freezing temperature in Russia and other aspects from Russian life extinguished the last spark of Pan-Slav in me. Cosmopolitanism was always completely alien to me, and so I returned to Prague as a Czech, a simple determined Czech, even with some secret sour feeling against the name Slav, which a better knowledge of Russia and Poland had made suspect to me. After some time, when I had somewhat forgotten the unpleasant impression, I again quieted down, and I was able to balance my unpleasant personal experiences and my former poetic enthusiasm. In short, I formed for myself principles about Slavdom and Czechdom, and these I now wish to put before my readers for their consideration.

No decent man should be a cosmopolitan (who says that he loves everybody, loves nobody), and it would be ridiculous to feel Indo-European patriotism and to write enthusiastic poetry about it; equally invalid, though to a lesser degree, is a Pan-Slav patriotism. Should somebody object that the differences among the Slav nations are not so great as among the Romance or the Teutonic nations, then we must simply disagree. Even if there be slighter differences among the various Slav languages than among the various Teutonic or Romance languages (though the Dutch tongue is nearer to German than Russian is to Czech, and between French and Italian there is not a greater difference than between Russian and Czech), we must not forget that nationality is determined not only by language but also by customs, religion, form of government, state of education, sympathies, and so on, and that the differences among the different nations are based upon these characteristics. If we take all that in due consideration, then we cannot say that Russians and Czechs, Poles and Russians, Illyrians and Poles show a greater affinity than any Teutonic or Romance nations. [...]

We cannot expect unity even among closely related Slav nations. On the contrary, the closer they live together the more disunity we may expect. Let us take the world as it is, and expect friendship and unity among people and nations only when this is advantageous for both sides. [...]

At the beginning, I sided with the Poles against the Russians. As soon as I recognized the true state of affairs in Poland, as soon as the veil which poetically hid from me the prosaic misery and corruption of the nation (that is, the Polish nobility) dropped from my eyes, my affection changed to dislike, and for a psychologically understandable reason the Russians appeared to me to be better than the Poles. This, however, did not last long. I soon recognized that Peter is like Paul, Russia like Poland. My Slav sympathy disappeared, and I learnt to regard the Russians and the Poles, in spite of the affinity of language, origin, and customs, as nations alien to us Czechs. [...] We must not look on Russian-Polish relations with such a blind eye as the greater part of Europe does; we should not think of an innocent lamb and a wolf, but know that there wolf meets wolf, and we shall say later that the lamb among them is the Ukrainian. The Poles themselves formerly tried to destroy Russia, and the Russians now try the opposite. [...] The Ukraine is the apple of discord which fate threw between these two nations. [...] Thus the suppression of Ukrainian liberty revenges itself on Poland and Russia. [...]

The Poles and the Russians buried the national spirit of the Ukraine and began to divide the great body, and, as generally happens in such cases, they began to fight and have not yet ceased. Both the Russians and the Poles regard the Ukrainian language as a dialect of their own language. [...] Thus we have seen great Eastern Slav nations, each one which hates the other two, and also has a just reason for it. Nobody can speak reasonably of brotherhood there. Nevertheless, the Pan-Slav idea has been accepted even by these nations. That might seem to contradict me: in reality the way in which Poles and Russians understood and accepted Pan-Slavism will prove that they do not deserve our sympathy.

The Russians (and I do not speak here of the government, because I cannot know its trend of thought) have taken up the idea of Pan-Slavism. In the whole world, but above all in Europe, the Russians are either disliked or rejected (and that almost always for good reasons); it was therefore surprising but most agreeable to them to find at least some friends in the West. Thus they declared immediately their friendship and brotherhood with us and the Illyrians but regarded themselves as the older brother, as our commander. The Russian Pan-Slavs believe that we and the Illyrians would like to be under their domination!! They are firmly convinced that they will one day control all Slav lands!!! They now look forward with joy to their future vineyards in Dalmatia. These gentlemen have started everywhere to say and write Slav instead of Russian, so that later they will again be able to say Russian instead of Slav. [...]

But let us be equally cool towards the Poles. They are like the Russians, but with tied hands. It is well known that formerly the Poles did not wish to know anything of the Slavs. Only when the Polish democrats and immigrants in France came upon the happy thought that perhaps the other Slavs could jointly with the Poles make light-hearted revolutions and thus serve them in their poorly calculated plans, did they begin to fraternize with us, and in their easy and sanguine temper they began to imagine how they would be the leaders among the Western liberal Slavs and how we should fight for them against everyone they hate! [...]

Finally, it is also significant that the Russians and the Poles exclude each other from the ranks of the Slavs: Russian scholars have proved that the Poles descend from the non-Slav Sarmatians (and be it said quietly that the Polish nobility thought so too, believing its blood superior to the Slav peasant blood), and the Poles on their part have proved that the Russians are of Mongol origin. [...]

What I wrote here stems from the reading of almost the whole literature on Pan-Slavism and from personal experiences. [...] And everything written here is my full conviction. The plain principles, once more summarized, are: the Slavs are not one nation but four nations as independent and unconnected as any other European nations. Each of these Slav nations stands for itself, and none is responsible for another; they share neither national honour nor national infamy. As the result of the great similarity of the Slav languages, it is useful and necessary for each Slav nation to pay as much attention to the literature of the others as possible, and to profit from their literatures and languages and nationality. Only between the Czechs and the Illyrians can there be more far-reaching sympathies, because under the present conditions one cannot be dangerous to the other but on the contrary useful. The Austrian monarchy is the best guarantee for the preservation of our and the Illyrian nationality, and the greater the power of the Austrian empire grows, the more secure our nationalities will be. It is impossible then for all Slavs to use one literary language, and therefore all efforts in this direction are meaningless, and as a waste of time, harmful.

The translation is an edited version of ‘The Danger of Pan-Slavism,’ in Hans Kohn, ed., *Nationalism: Its Meaning and History* (London and New York: Nostrand Reinhold, 1965), pp. 155–59. Originally published in Hans Kohn, *The Mind of Modern Russia* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1955), pp. 83–90.

PETITION TO THE EMPEROR AGAINST THE UNIFICATION OF BOHEMIA AND MORAVIA

Title: *Adresa císaři proti spojení Čech s Moravou* (Petition to the Emperor against the unification of Bohemia and Moravia)

Originally published: issued on April 4, 1848

Language: German

The text used is from Jindřich Dvořák, *Moravské sněmování roku 1848–1849* (Sessions of the Moravian Diet, 1848–49) (Telč: Emil Šolc, 1898), pp. 94–97.

Context

Moravia has been one of the historical lands of the Bohemian Crown since the eleventh century. Ever since the early Middle Ages, however, when it was raised to a margraviate, it had its own administrative system and Diet. Since the mid-fifteenth century Bohemia and Moravia had been formally united, but administration remained divided and Moravia and Bohemia occasionally each had a different ruler, though most often it was someone from the same ruling dynasty. At the end of the eighteenth century, and again in the period between the two world wars, Moravia was administratively united with the Czechoslovak part of Silesia. Moravia was inhabited by people of Slav and German origins. Germans were settled in the south, in adjacent Silesia to the north, and in the larger towns, whereas Czechs were settled in the central parts and were slightly greater in number. Because of the separate administration, closer ties with Vienna, and the slight economic backwardness of Moravian Czechs, not only in comparison to Germans but also to Czechs in Bohemia, the Czech national movement had a less dynamic development here. As a result, the *Landespatriotismus* had a stronger impact and above all longer life, not only among the Moravian aristocracy and clergy, but also among the German and Czech bourgeoisie. The first important period with respect to Czech nationalism was the 1830s, when individual ‘awakeners’ started to spread the ideas of Czech cultural nationalism in Moravia. The

most important of them came from Bohemia (F. C. Kampelík, F. M. Klácel, A. V. Šembera). Their campaign was particularly successful in Moravian educational institutions, the noble academies in Brno (*Ger.* Brunn) and Olomouc (*Ger.* Olmütz), and the theological seminary in Brno.

In the Brno seminary a circle of patriotic priests gathered, whose *spiritus rector* was František Sušil (1804–1868). This group took the Cyril and Methodius tradition as the central point of their patriotism (Cyril and Methodius were ninth-century Byzantine missionaries who Christianized the Great Moravian Empire, and were later canonized). What came out of the vaguely formulated program of the Brno seminary circle was a synthesis of Roman Catholicism, Moravian patriotism, Czech national consciousness, and Pan-Slavism. They did not form a political movement, and their chief impact came from the fact that most of them spread their patriotic ideas among the Czech-speaking people in their parishes.

The second phase of the spread of Czech national ideas began in 1848–49. The revolutionary atmosphere brought a new dynamic to national agitation. In the *Reichsrat* and the Slav Congress in Prague, the Moravian Czech deputies met their colleagues from Bohemia and realized that they had much in common. At the same time, in Moravia, similarly to Bohemia, the relationship of Czechs and Germans became of central importance for the first time, since both sides realized that they had different political visions with respect to the Greater-German movement. This was a significant factor in the subsequent increase of nationalist agitation in both communities.

As it turned out at the political level, however, *Landespatriotismus* in Moravia still outweighed Czech liberal nationalism. In early March 1848, the St. Wenceslas Committee in Prague (which is considered the initial stage of the real political activity of Czech liberalism) sent two petitions to the Emperor. Among a number of democratic requests there was also a demand for the constitutional unification of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia. The reaction of the Moravian Czech patriots was on the whole negative. Not only did the politicians from Prague fail to consult with the Moravians regarding the request for unification, but unification was understood as a menace to Moravian independence. Referring to the liberal principle of freedom, the patriotic journal *Týdeník* (Weekly) rejected the proposed unity of the Bohemian Lands, while stressing the close ties between both lands and, above all, “the Czech and Moravian nation.”

The request of the St. Wenceslas Committee soon became a subject of discussion in the Moravian Diet session. The Diet committee, led by Alois Pražák, the future leader of the Moravian People’s Party (the key Czech-

speaking liberal force in Moravia), labeled the petition for constitutional unification an intolerable attack on Moravian independence. In the general discussion, warning voices (particularly that of Count Sylva-Taroucca) also appeared, arguing that the only prospects for Moravians lay in either becoming totally Germanized or joining the Czech national movement. The Diet had drawn up a petition to the Emperor, however, in which they repeated the negative stance of the Diet committee to a constitutional unification of their land with Bohemia. The petition emphasized that in the interest of Austria, the 'common motherland,' and in accordance with historical development, Moravia had to remain an independent country, legally subordinated exclusively to the House of Habsburg.

The majority of the members of the Diet were a mixture of the aristocracy and the representatives of the Roman Catholic Church—that is to say, people indifferent to the ideas of the young national movement. The Diet petition to the Emperor shows that the consciousness of Moravian autonomy was still quite strong at this time. It also shows that Moravians were aware of the close ties with Bohemia and of the dynamic progress of Czech nationalism. After the renewal of constitutional life in Austria in the 1860s, the Moravian Czechs clearly leaned towards the Czech national mainstream and accepted the political program of Czech 'historical rights.' The older kind of Moravian patriotism played an important role until it was overshadowed by Czech nationalism. The dénouement came in the 1880s with a new generation of Moravian Czech nationalists. They completely acknowledged the cultural and political predominance of Prague and devoted their work to furthering the Czech national movement. Since that time Moravian regional consciousness has been a layer of identity of many Moravian Czechs that can hardly challenge the main national allegiance. From time to time during the twentieth century, however, the defense of Moravian specificity against the centralism of Prague had played a certain political role (in times of unrest, such as the Prague Spring of 1968 or the Velvet Revolution in 1989).

MK

Petition to the Emperor against the Unification of Bohemia and Moravia

The assembled Moravian Diet expresses the conviction, which is instilled in most of the inhabitants of Moravia, namely, that at present it believes that the expression of all provincial efforts must be made subordinate to the

commonweal of the shared homeland, and speaks out firmly against the wishes of the residents of Prague who desire the joining of Bohemia and Moravia in a joint assembly for these lands.

The loyal and obedient Moravian estates cannot, first and foremost, consider the wishes of the capital city, Prague, to be an expression of the requests of the whole Kingdom of Bohemia, because only the estates of this kingdom are the legal organ that may make requests to Your Imperial and Royal Majesty in the matter of the state-rights position of Bohemia with regard to Moravia. The assembled Moravian estates, however, protest as solemnly as possible, in the name of the country represented by them, against all testimony of the capital city, Prague, or the land of Bohemia, which is aimed against the integrity of Moravia or is meant to recognize the independence of this land from the kingdom of Bohemia.

In the history of the land one cannot find any document according to which contemporary Moravia would, after the fall of the Great Moravian Empire, have agreed rightfully to relinquish its independence from the Kingdom of Bohemia. The fact that by and large one sovereign ruled in these lands is not, however, based on legal necessity, but on the election of the estates, agreements concluded for the maintenance of the independence of Moravia, and hereditary right. The history of the land has seen times, however, when even this claim to rule in both lands varied, whereby each of them had its own sovereign, who was independent of the other sovereign. Nor is there any legal relationship based on the charters of incorporation of 1348 and 1355 other than the joining of the two lands under a single sovereign.

Since the time of Konrad, the first margrave of Moravia, in 1182, who received the land in fief from the German emperor, the dispute between Bohemia and Moravia over this independence has been decided in favor of Moravia.

Since 1298 Moravia has had its own district administrator; since 1348 it has had its own land rolls. As far back as one can remember Moravia has had its own estates [diets] and courts of law, and since 1535 it has had its own administration; Moravia has always had a separate emblem, different from the Bohemian, which since 1462 has looked as it does today.

The estates of both lands have always been considered equal to each other, for as early as 1435 the Bohemian estates sent delegates to the Moravian Diet, so that they could reach an agreement with King Sigismund.

The *Kniha tovažská tit. VIII. a XXXI.*, the oldest book of the laws in Moravia, which was confirmed *in vim legis* (as valid law) by King Maximilian in 1567, shows that both the estates and the Bohemian sovereigns recognized

the independence of Moravia. In 1453, homage was paid to King Ladislav,¹ first in Brünn and only later in Bohemia; the dispute over this which arose between the Bohemian diet and the Moravian was not settled till the Bohemian estates presented Moravia with the statement in which they said that in their view when the Moravians accepted Ladislav as their sovereign before the Czechs the Moravians had acted in a fitting and proper manner and in accordance with the law, and they, the Czechs, did not see the Moravians as their vassals but as their dear brothers, blood relations, and good friends. In *Tit. XXXI.*, the liberty and independence of Moravia is expressed, and so is the difference, defined by the estates, between the two lands—namely, that the Bohemian estates shall swear an oath of servitude to the king, but the Moravian estates shall only take a vow.

After the death of King Louis, the Bohemians elected as king Ferdinand I,² husband of Princess Anne, daughter of King Vladislav,³ without inviting the Moravians to the election. The Moravians protested against the election, recognizing Ferdinand I as king only after Princess Anne ceded Moravia, by the legal route, to her husband Ferdinand I for life. The Moravian estates also refused Ferdinand I, who was elected king in Bohemia, entrance to Moravia as long as he lacked a letter of safe conduct from them.

Moravian independence, declared also as a constitutional law by the Moravian government in 1535, was never quashed.

Matthias,⁴ as margrave of Moravia, had the estates pay homage to him at the diet in Brünn in 1608, while his brother Rudolf was still ruling in Bohemia. By a Letter of Majesty, issued on 19 February 1613, Matthias confirmed the liberty and independence of Moravia.

Whenever the envoys of the Moravian estates were called to Prague for an extraordinary diet, it took place only with the issuing of a declaration that this voluntary sending of delegates to the extraordinary diet was never intended to prejudice the rights and freedoms of Moravia and its estates.

¹ Ladislaus (1440–1457), Archduke of Austria, king of Hungary as László V; king of Bohemia as Ladislav I.

² Ferdinand I Habsburg, King of Bohemia and Hungary (r. 1526–1564) and Holy Roman Emperor (r. 1558–1564). By uniting the Austrian, Bohemian and Hungarian lands under his rule, he laid foundations of the Habsburg Monarchy lasting until 1918.

³ Ladislaus II (Cz. Vladislav Jagellonský, *Hun.* Ulászló II), King of Bohemia from 1471 and of Hungary from 1490, until his death in 1516.

⁴ Matthias I (r. 1612–1619), Holy Roman Emperor, also king of Hungary (as Mátyás II, from 1608) and Bohemia (Cz. Matyáš II, from 1611). He occupied the imperial throne by forcing his brother, Rudolf II to abdicate.

At the diet of 1617, the Moravian estates complained that the Bohemians crowned Ferdinand II king of Bohemia without calling upon the Moravians; but because he was the grandson of King Ferdinand I and Queen Anne, and his successor, they accepted him as margrave of Moravia.

If on fol. I of the new constitution, promulgated on 10 May 1628, there is mention of Moravia as an incorporated land, and if Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia, as well as Upper and Lower Lusatia are named on fol. XII of the same constitution as incorporated lands, it clearly shows only the mutually equal status of these lands and their having joined under one sovereign, as is also clear from the oath of allegiance on fol. III, which the Bohemian king must himself take as margrave of Moravia.

Similarly, this constitution cannot be to the detriment of the independence of the margraviate of Moravia, even less so because Ferdinand II, by a supreme decision taken on 26 June 1628, confirmed several freedoms by name to the Moravian estates, by which Moravian independence from Bohemia was secured.

With his Pragmatic Sanction, issued on 30 September 1720, His Majesty the Emperor Charles VI confirmed the line of hereditary succession in all the independent lands of his kingdom and consequently also by the Moravian estates. This act would certainly have been unnecessary had the sovereign, under the basic laws, considered Moravia independent from Bohemia.

Lastly, the loyal and obedient estates of Moravia refer to the declarations that were made to the Moravian estates by the renowned forebears of Your Majesty and also as the result of homage paid to Your Majesty. With each of these declarations it was expressed from the highest place that the paying of homage in Prague was not to the detriment of the Moravian independence from Bohemia.

For these reasons the loyal and obedient estates of Moravia express their conviction that:

1. Moravia is a land independent of Bohemia, belonging only to the whole union of the Austrian monarchy.

2. *Between the two lands there has always been a close union based on the same nationality and one sovereign*; the uniting of the estates [diets] cannot, however, be expressed as a basic law, because that would violate the constitution and independence of Moravia.

Also, considerations of the material interests and sympathies of the Moravian land lead the Moravian estates to speak out against the merging of the

diets and polities of Bohemia and Moravia; even less so can the Moravian estates allow themselves to be moved to accommodate the wishes of the capital city, Prague, because they would thereby prejudice the rights of the residents of the towns and villages of Moravia, residents who were, at the sessions of the Moravian estates, unanimously invited to the representative body of the land, but are still not represented by free elections in that diet.

The most important task of the loyal and obedient estates of Moravia must therefore first of all be the buttressing and expanding of the constitution of the land, in accordance with the intention of Your Imperial and Royal Majesty, expressed by the supreme rescript, issued on 18 March of this year, so that the rights of all the inhabitants of this land may be defended by the freely elected representatives of all the towns and villages, and so that, under the protection of this constitution, the national specificities and individuality of the whole people of Moravia lead to stable, uninterrupted development.

As the loyal and obedient Moravian estates give Your Imperial and Royal Majesty for sanction, which is stipulated by the constitutional law, the relevant documents on the representation of towns and villages, which are already being worked on, so, too, the Moravian estates are assiduously seeing to it that all the wishes of the land, which aim to support the tasks set out above and to establish a free constitutional government, are satisfied, and presented for supreme approval. The Moravian estates will consequently always support, among other things, the *preservation of a friendly, firm union with the Kingdom of Bohemia*, which is allied with Moravia by the same nationality and same tongue, so long as this does not threaten the independence of Moravia. [...]

Translated by Derek Paton

JOHANN MAJLÁTH: AN EXAMINATION OF THE QUESTION: WHETHER TO ANNEX THE CARPATHIAN SLAVS AND RUTHENIANS TO THE MAGYARS

Title: *Beleuchtung der Frage, ob die karpatischen Szlaven und Ruthenen wieder den Magyaren zuzuteilen, oder als selbstständige Distrikte nach ihrer Nationalität zu behandeln sind* (An examination of the question: whether to annex the Carpathian Slavs and Ruthenians to the Magyars or to deal with them as autonomous districts according to nationality)

Originally published: The text was an internal memo for the imperial government and was therefore not published at the time of its origin

Language: German

The excerpts used are from Daniel Rapant, ed., *Slovenské povstanie 1848–1849*, Vol. III., Part 2., (Bratislava: SAV, 1954), pp. 532–534.

About the author

Count Johann (János) Majláth [1786, Pest – 1855, Starnberg (Bavaria)]: landowner, historian, publicist and politician. Majláth came from an aristocratic family originating from Transylvania but settled in Upper Hungary since the seventeenth century. After finishing university studies in philosophy and law, he was employed in the Hungarian governmental offices in Buda and Vienna. Later he turned to historical studies and literature. During the 1840s he worked for the Hungarian literary almanac *Aurora* and edited the German-language *Iris*. Politically he belonged to the conservative camp opposing the Hungarian reform movement, especially the radical current led by **Lajos Kossuth**. He was in favor of cooperation between the Hungarian political elite and the Court of Vienna; he was therefore critical of the prevalent anti-Habsburg undertones of Hungarian politics and also supported national tolerance in Hungary. In 1848 Majláth moved from Hungary to Vienna and later to Munich. He remained an advocate of the unified Habsburg monarchy and of the conservative political system built on a loyal supra-national bureaucracy. Ravaged by political failures, problems with family estates and personal troubles, he committed suicide in 1855. Majláth wrote several historical compilations on the history of Hungary, Europe and Vienna and on the religious question in Hungary. He collected indigenous Hungarian tales and legends and published a Hungarian textbook for German speakers. He also published poetry and translations from Hungarian to German and compiled the first German-language history of Hungarian poetry.

Main works: *Magyarische Sagen und Märchen* [Hungarian sagas and tales] (1825); *Magyarische Gedichte* [Hungarian poems] (1825); *Geschichte der Magyaren*

[History of the Magyars], 5 vols., (1828–31); *Über die Krönung der Könige in Ungarn* [Concerning the coronation of the kings in Hungary] (1830); *Geschichte der Stadt Wien von der Gründung derselben bis 1830* [History of Vienna from its foundation till 1830] (1832); *Geschichte des österreichischen Kaiserhauses* [History of the Austrian Imperial House], 5 vols., (1834–50); *Vallásmozgalmak Magyarországbán* [Religious movements in Hungary] 2 vols., (1844–46); *Geschichte der europäischen Staaten* [History of the European states] (1853).

Context

Federalism was a principle of re-organization contemplated by different political camps in the 1840s, usually promoted by circles opposed to the Habsburg Court. The revolutionary atmosphere in 1848 created a space in which these programs and their political, social and cultural consequences were discussed. The federalization of the monarchy, promoted especially by the Slavic nations and the Romanians, was seen for some time as a possible way out of the current crisis. The principles of federalization as well as the concrete design of the future state were earnestly discussed not only on the floor of the Imperial Diet in Kremsier (Cz. Kroměříž) but also in the press.

In the autumn of 1848 the existence of the monarchy was in question and the Imperial government concentrated on fighting first the revolution in Vienna and later that in Hungary. After the defeat of the revolutionary uprising in Prague in June 1848, the conflict between the two strongest political forces in the Austrian monarchy reached its peak. The camp of the Hungarian revolutionaries was also divided, but the position of **Lajos Kossuth**, advocating a radical administrative separation from Vienna, became increasingly influential. In response, the Imperial Court and the general staff, after initial hesitation, became increasingly inclined to suppress the Hungarian revolution and restore unity and ‘order’ in the monarchy via military intervention.

In this situation new ideological tools were sought to secure the Monarchy from ‘Hungarian radicalism,’ and federalism—originally the weapon of the critics of the Habsburg government—became instrumentalized by the Court as well. A division of Hungary into ‘national provinces’ and their direct formal and legal integration into the Habsburg monarchy became a favorite conception among the representatives of the government led by Duke Felix Schwarzenberg, especially after the Imperial army crossed the borders of Hungary in December 1848. The government called on several experts to elaborate on the issues connected with the Austro-Federalist project, such as

the ethnic structure, geopolitical situation, or economic and cultural level of particular nations.

Count Majláth, held to be one of the leading experts on Hungary still loyal to the House of Habsburg, submitted six such papers intended for the internal use of the government in 1848–1849. He stressed the principle of the equality of nations, striving to project it onto territorial dimensions as well, and paid special attention to the Slovak question. His premise, reiterating the absolutist argument of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, was that the Hungarian ‘rebellion’ provided the Imperial government with an opportunity to disregard Hungarian historical rights and to impose a new political framework. According to Majláth, Hungary should exist only formally, and in practice be divided into seven national districts each with a provincial Diet and administration headed by a special imperial commissioner. The districts were to be incorporated into the framework of the monarchy and represented in the Viennese Imperial Diet by their own deputies. The official language of the respective district was to be selected according to the language of the dominant ethnic group. The ‘District of the Carpathian Slavs’ with its capital of Banská Bystrica (*Hun.* Besztercebánya, *Ger.* Neusohl) was thus supposed to be governed by Slovaks and Ruthenians. Majláth suggested that the districts be established and their deputies nominated immediately, concurrently with the progress of the Imperial army. In the present paper, he is also at pains to revisit both the positive and the negative consequences of the prospective autonomy of the Slovaks and the Ruthenians from the Magyars, and, after taking into account all the historical, political, geographical, and mental factors, he came out in support of the autonomy of the “Carpathian Slavs” within Hungary.

Majláth gave precedence to the interests of the Imperial government and Habsburg Court above all other considerations. His thinking accorded with the policy of restoring unity and order in the monarchy. Majláth's plan to rebuild the monarchy shared certain features with the efforts of the Slovak nationalists to establish a legal framework for their national and political autonomy, and, indeed, he maintained contact with several Slovak activists such as Michal M. Hodža, Jozef M. Hurban, and Štefan Závodník. Nevertheless, his proposals failed to find agreement with the influential Duke Windischgrätz, an ‘Old-Conservative’ general, as well as with a number of ministers in the government.

Thus, after the crushing of the Hungarian revolution the government eventually decided to reorganize the state on different principles. The federalization plans were renounced, and Vienna imposed centralism by martial law,

leading to the forming of the 'neo-absolutistic' regime at the beginning of the 1850s. In spite of failing to have any political impact, Majláth's papers were later rediscovered by Slovak historiography and viewed as an 'alternative' tradition in the Habsburg politics favoring the efforts of the Slovak national movement.

PL-MK

**An examination of the question:
whether to annex the Carpathian Slavs and Ruthenians
to the Magyars, or to deal with them as autonomous
districts according to nationality**

In order adequately to answer the question before us, it is necessary to examine the grounds which are adduced for the one as well as for the other view. The conclusion then follows naturally.

Favoring the reunification of the Carpathian Slavs and the Ruthenians with the Magyars are the following arguments:

1. The Slavs and the Ruthenians are inert peoples, they have not expressed a wish to be independent.
2. If the Slavs become independent, they will be possessed by Czechism, and thus strengthen the principle of Slavism in the Monarchy.
3. The Magyars will be better disposed to the government if the government does not dissociate the Carpathian Slavs and Ruthenians from the Magyars.
4. Equality of the nationalities presupposes equal competence, but the Carpathian Slavs and the Ruthenians are not as competent as the Magyars so they cannot also be equal.

On the other hand, those who consciously want to separate the Slavs and the Ruthenians in the Carpathians from the Magyars and to deal with these nationalities independently say that:

1. The Slavs are not an inert people, they have been suppressed and are only awaiting the opportunity to be able to express their own independence and nationality.
2. If the Slavs were independent, they would be less inclined to fall under the influence of Czechism than if they were assigned again to the Magyars,

for the Magyars would force the Magyar language upon the Slavs, undermine their nationality and in this way drive them right into the arms of the Czechs.

3. The Magyars will not be thankful to the government if the Slavs and the Ruthenians were again associated with them, for on the one hand it will be perceived as though the government feared the Hungarian tribe, and on the other hand they will always want the Magyar tribe to annex the Croatsians, the Romanians, and the Transylvanian Saxons. Similarly, in 1832–36 the government gave the three Transylvanian counties back to the Magyars, and the Magyars were not thereby satisfied in the least, but rather all the more vehemently demanded the annexation of the whole of Transylvania.

4. Even if one accepts the still very questionable proposition that the Carpathian Slavs and the Ruthenians are not as equally competent as the Magyars, one must for this very reason make them equal, because only by their obtaining equal rights can they attain equal competence. Under Magyar sovereignty they will not attain equal competence. If one looks at the question of equal competence, the question must be asked whether the Magyars are as competent as the Bohemians or the Transylvanian Saxons. Who would in the end be able to ascertain the relationship between the nationalities in the monarchy? The government must hold fast to the principle that each nationality has equal rights.

Besides these refutational principles the following principles also speak for the independence of the Carpathian Slavs and the Ruthenians.

1. To subordinate the Slavs to the Magyars means to punish the faithful and reward and strengthen rebellion.

2. The principle of equal rights of the nationalities brings with it the independence of the Carpathian Slavs and Ruthenians.

3. If the Carpathian Slavs are indeed joined to the Magyars, it would be damaging to the whole monarchy, for then they and the Magyars will make up a mass of eight million people and will consequently aspire to the same position that Hungary had before March 1848.

4. The Magyar Diet will aspire to independence and then a common Diet for the monarchy will be impossible.

5. The Magyars will insist upon a coronation and the election of the palatine.

6. The administrative difficulties that one has had with Hungary for three hundred years would be renewed.

7. The amalgamation of the Monarchy into a whole is impossible.

8. In such circumstances there will again exist a Magyar army, not a Magyar regiment. We have just seen where that leads.

9. Slavic Protestantism will be delivered into the hands of the Magyars. Whereas it is presently sympathetic to the monarchy, it will thereafter be separatist.

10. The Slavs will be in constant communication with the highest judicial authority in Pest, and consequently with the revolutionary party domiciled in Pest.

11. If the Slavs are not annexed to the Magyars in a just fashion, and this is very likely, they will always remain dissatisfied; there will always be difficulties, and the government will not be able to help any more.

12. The Galician Ruthenians are to be extracted from the supremacy of the Poles; why then should the Ruthenians in Hungary remain under Magyar supremacy?

13. The Croatians, Serbs, Romanians ["Wallachians"] and Transylvanian Saxons are to be removed from the supremacy of the Magyars, so why shouldn't the Carpathian Slavs be as well?

14. It is easier to Germanize than to Magyarize the Carpathian Slavs.

It follows from all of this that the proposal to subordinate the Carpathian Slavs and the Ruthenians to the Magyars contradicts the interests of the whole monarchy, and also that, according to the governmental principle of the equality of nationalities, the Ruthenians in Hungary are to be united with the Ruthenians in Galicia and so form a single Ruthenia, while the Slavs in the Carpathians must be dealt with as a province independent of the Magyars.

Translated by Pavol Lukáč

LAJOS KOSSUTH: PROPOSAL. CONCERNING THE FUTURE POLITICAL ESTABLISHMENT OF HUNGARY

Title: *Javaslat. Magyar Ország jövő politicalai szervezetét illetőleg – tekintettel a nemzetiségi kérdés megoldására* (Proposal. Concerning the future political establishment of Hungary, in view of solving the nationality question)

Originally published: The text in its present form was written in 1859 and remained in manuscript

Language: French/Hungarian

The text, originally written in French, survived in various versions. The first draft was published in English as well as in French in 1851, while an extended version in French (*Projet d'organisation de la Hongrie la question des nationalités étant prise en considération*) was published by Dániel Irányi and Charles-Louis Chassin in 1859. The current version, the most complete, remained in manuscript until published by György Spira, *Kossuth és alkotmányterve* (Debrecen: Csokonai, 1989). The excerpts used are from: *Kossuth Lajos alkotmányterve* (Budapest: Budapest Főváros Levéltára, 1994), pp. 50–59.

About the author

Lajos Kossuth [1802, Monok (Upper Hungary) – 1894, Turin]: lawyer, journalist, politician. His family was from the Upper-Hungarian petty-nobility, ethnically Slavic and Lutheran by denomination. Trained as a lawyer, he entered politics first in 1832 as a representative of an absentee aristocrat in the Upper House. Between 1832 and 1836 he edited the *Országgyűlési Tudósítások* (Reports from the Diet), the principal popularizing organ of the reform movement. By the mid-1830s he became a key figure in the liberal nationalist opposition. He was arrested in 1837, but popular pressure forced the Metternich regime to release him in 1840. He edited the journal *Pesti Hírlap* (Pest Gazette), which became the most important organ of the opposition in the forties. He was a protagonist in the Hungarian revolution of 1848, becoming Minister of Finance in the revolutionary government of Lajos Batthyány. When the Austrian government openly sided with the *ban* (viceroy) of Croatia, Count Jelačić, who was moving against Hungary, Kossuth became head of the ‘Committee of National Defense’ which assumed the reins of government. His government withdrew to Debrecen before the advance of the Austrians under General Windischgrätz. In April 1849 the Hungarian parliament declared Hungary an independent republic,

with Kossuth as governor. The Hungarians won several victories, but Russian troops intervened in favor of Austria, and Kossuth was obliged to offer the government to General Artúr Görgey, who finally surrendered at Világos. Kossuth fled first to Turkey, and then to England. From 1865 he lived in Italy. He could not accept the *Ausgleich* of 1867, and refused an offer of amnesty in 1890. After his death in Turin his body was returned to Budapest and buried with official ceremony. One of the most important nineteenth century Hungarian politicians, Kossuth became the symbol of ‘national independence,’ used and abused by various regimes in the twentieth century.

Main works: *Felelet* [Answer] (1841); *1847-es Ellenzéki nyilatkozat* [The Opposition Declaration of 1847] (with Ferenc Deák); *Irataim az emigrációból* [My writings from emigration], vols. I–III (1880–82).

Context

Soon after the initial enthusiasm for the revolution in March 1848, the Hungarian liberal nationalist leadership had to face growing discontent on the part of considerable segments of the nationalities of the country, who expected it to acknowledge not only their individual civil rights but also their right to form a separate national body with territorial self-government. At the outset the Hungarian revolutionaries perceived these demands as opposed to the sweeping measures of modernization they proposed, and blamed the elites of these nationalities for sticking to their purported “feudal privileges” instead of accepting the Hungarian liberal offer and together with it a dominant symbolic position in the Hungarian national project. It was only after the painful experience of a series of clashes—with the Croatian army of Count Jelačić, with the Serbian and Romanian guerrilla armies in southern Hungary and Transylvania, respectively, and with the less numerous but still considerable Slovak nationalist movement—that the Hungarian liberals were forced to reformulate their national agenda.

Kossuth himself started his political career as an ardent nationalist, and his position on the nationality question was one of the main points of contention in the early 1840s between him and **István Széchenyi**, who came to consider the impatient assimilatory discourse of the Hungarian liberal nationalist camp as potentially self-destructive. Kossuth remained suspicious of the demands of the nationalities during the entire ‘War of Independence’ and shifted to a more conciliatory political stance only at the end of the fight, mainly thanks to the efforts of Hungarian revolutionary diplomacy, and especially László Teleki (1811–1861), who was a special envoy of the revolutionary government in Paris with close links to other Eastern-European émigré communities. The representatives of these revolutionary émigrés (such as the Roma-

nian **Nicolae Bălcescu**) made considerable efforts to reconcile the last bastion of the European revolutionary movement with the leaders of the nationality movements within the country. The result of the negotiations was the 1849/VIIIth so-called 'Nationality Law,' which offered considerable concessions to the nationalities; it was, however, more of symbolic importance, since it was accepted in July 1849, on the very eve of the collapse of the Hungarian army.

After the fall of the revolutionary government, Kossuth turned again to the nationality question in his constitutional proposal written in 1851 while in exile in the Turkish town of Kütahya. By that time it was a commonly shared opinion that one of the main reasons for the failure of the revolution was the outbreak of conflicts between the Hungarians and the other nationalities. As an émigré politician hoping to return to Hungary with the new revolutionary conjuncture, he was pressed by international circles favorable to the Hungarian revolutionary cause (especially that around Giuseppe Mazzini, as well as the European Democratic Central Committee led by the Frenchman Alexandre-Auguste Ledru-Rollin, the German Arnold Ruge and the Pole Wojciech Władysław Darasz), to come up with a proposal for settling the nationality issue in an acceptable way to the Croats, Slovaks, Serbs and Romanians living in the territory of 'historical Hungary.' Federalism was a fashionable idea in these circles, and shortly before Kossuth's proposal, **Bălcescu**, for instance, came up with the concept of Serbian-Hungarian-Romanian trialism.

There was also a favorable conjuncture, as the nationalities were not satisfied with the measures of the Viennese government, which, after crushing the Hungarian revolution, disregarded its previous promises concerning the federalization of the country and reverted to an indiscriminate authoritarianism. It seemed likely that if the Hungarian leadership made a favorable offer to the nationalities they might be able to count on their support upon resuming their revolutionary activities. The Hungarian émigrés were encouraged in this by the shift in the attitude of prominent Serbian politicians like the Prime Minister **Ilija Garašanin**, who expressed sympathy toward the Hungarian cause.

While it failed to have any practical impact due to the changing international climate, Kossuth's proposal, commonly referred to as the 'Kütahya Constitution,' served as a basis of further constitutional deliberation throughout the 1850s. It became topical again especially after 1858, when the Austrian defeat at the hand of the Italians opened up the way to fresh speculations concerning a renewed outbreak of revolution in Hungary. At the request of Dániel Irányi (1822–1892), one of the protagonists of the Hungarian emigration in France, Kossuth returned to work on his draft in 1859.

Kossuth had two principal aims in his constitutional proposals. One was to harmonize individual liberties and collective rights, while the other was to make a fundamental distinction between those communities that possessed a 'historical right' to independent national development and those that possessed only an ethnic basis for claiming institutional separation. Kossuth was willing to concede the right of secession to the Croats, whose status he defined as that of an "allied nation," whereas in the case of the other nationalities he offered those rights (individual and collective) which would not endanger the "unity of the State." In the version of 1859 he went as far as envisioning the possibility of a Serbian entity under a freely elected voivode, and the possibility of a Transylvanian constitutional separation (upon a plebiscite), which would secure the rights of all three nationalities living there, Romanian, German, and Hungarian. He believed such an arrangement would guarantee the national identity of the minorities, but at the same time maintain some kind of administrative and political integrity at the state level, while also safeguarding the precarious status of the various ethnic communities living in territories with mixed populations.

While the 'Proposal' documents Kossuth's gradual shift towards a more conciliatory position on the nationality question, it also indicates the considerable limitations of his thinking. In the letter to Irányi he formulated a more tolerant vision, allowing for the territorial self-government of Transylvania and Vojvodina and the use of vernacular languages not only in municipal bodies but also in the Parliament. When Irányi asked his permission to publish the letter, Kossuth reverted to a more limited position, arguing that these were just tactical concessions to be offered in extreme necessity, and not his real political platform.

The constitutional proposal, in its various forms, became a crucial reference for the émigré groups, and also found its way back to Hungary, where it was ardently discussed. Nevertheless, its value was rather symbolic, meant as a gesture for governments (mostly Piedmont and France), which were generally favorable to the Hungarian cause, but were also demanding the emancipation of other nationalities within the country. At the same time, the solution proposed was not really satisfactory for the elites of these nationalities, who were aiming at establishing compact territorial units on the basis of ethno-linguistic allegiance. In addition, its provisions were far more liberal than the instincts of the Hungarian political elite at home, who had been engaged in a "passive resistance" movement and, propelled by their fear of the nationalities, eventually started negotiating with Vienna concerning the re-establishment of Hungary's constitutional status. Thus, the proposal did not have much practical conse-

quence; nevertheless, it can be considered as the most articulate document of the conciliatory intentions of the émigré revolutionary movement. It is along these lines that in the 1910s the civic radicals and in the 1930s the populists invoked Kossuth's constitutional projects, in support of their vision of a "Danubian confederation."

BT

**Proposal.
Concerning the future political establishment of Hungary,
in view of solving the nationality question**

You asked me what are my views about the solution of the nationality question.

You will find my answer to this great and important question in the Proposal Concerning the Structure of the Country presented above.

Read it through carefully and you shall see that from the individual rights held to be inviolable—and this includes the right to freedom of thought, freedom of religion and free association through all the constitutive layers of the state, in the city, in the county, in legislation, in the government, in jurisdiction, in public administration, in public education—that is, in every possible aspect, I pay such a consistent attention to the requirements, the elevation, the safeguarding and the development of the nationalities that, unless it happened to be your desire that the state should fall apart to the common ruination of the Hungarian as well as the other nationalities, I hardly know what else you may wish for.

One other thing, however, I want to mention.

There is a distinction to be made between the peoples living mixed in the territory of the Hungarian Crown and the (symbolically speaking) separate parts of the Hungarian Crown.

It is only Croatia and Slavonia¹ that fit the latter category in all respects—including Dalmatia as well, if the Dalmatian nation, which has been isolated for a long time, wishes to ally or unite with them.

With respect to both their compact nationality and their territory, these associated countries have always been separate countries historically—they are not parts but companions of Hungary.

¹ Administrative entity of the Hungarian kingdom, mostly inhabited by Croatians. Today it forms part of Croatia.

If these countries are willing to maintain their historical connection with Hungary, I deem it only fair that in their internal government they should be acknowledged as perfectly independent from the Hungarian government and legislation in every conceivable aspect. Let them arrange their affairs themselves in the townships, in the counties, and in legislation as they will—let themselves elect their *bans*²—let them administer themselves as they like—let them be as perfectly independent, even in matters of inspection, from the Hungarian Government and the Hungarian Parliament as the sovereign states comprising the North American confederation. Between them and Hungary only a *tie of association* should exist, and the authority of common legislation and the principal government should in their case be restricted to the matters that concern both them and Hungary. These matters should be listed in a new treaty of confederation (I include here no more than land and naval home-defense, relations with foreign powers, customs, the system of trade and the main transport lines to the sea in which they have a joint interest).

I wish from my heart that our Croatian, Slavonian, Dalmatian brothers be content with this, to the common good of all of us.

If, however, they are tired of the 600-year-old connection which has provided a constitutional past for them, if they do not wish to join hands with us to break the Austrian yoke for good under any other condition than that, as a reward for the victory to be achieved by our joint efforts, they may be separated from us and set up independent states, terminating their connection with us totally—then I beg them to consider soberly what they are doing. But if this is really what they want, I say *let them have it as they like*; I am ready to accept it, and I solemnly declare that it is not becoming the freedom-loving temperament of the Hungarian nation to insist on an associate connection against their wishes. In the latter case I deem only an agreement about the following points to be necessary.

a) That our Croatian, Slavonian and (provided they join the former) Dalmatian brethren, whatever form of government they may adopt, should not elect a sovereign for themselves from the Austrian House.

b) A mutual trade contract should be made ensuring safe transit.

c) Fiume³ should be given a free opportunity to decide whether she wants to belong to Hungary or Croatia or to be, following the ancient ex-

² Traditionally the highest administrative office of Croatia under the Hungarian Crown, a sort of viceroy.

³ Present-day Rijeka (Croatia), which held a special legal status in the nineteenth century.

ample of the Hansa, a free city and port under the joint protection of both countries.

d) Pétervárad⁴ has little or no internal importance for Slavonia, while it constitutes a key to Lower Hungary. For this reason, it should either remain in Hungarian hands or be given a joint garrison whose numbers are to be defined.

So much for the Associated Countries.

With so much community of interest related to personal matters, family and estates which has accumulated during the 600-year-long contact, and also out of regard for stability in the future, wouldn't our Croatian brethren best safeguard their interests by holding to the first proposal that would provide a perfect guarantee for their nationality, national status and national self-government and establishing their connection with us upon confederate foundations?—This question I wish to commit to their sober reflection and free judgement.

As for Transylvania: Transylvania is not to be treated along the same lines as Croatia. It is neither a single, compact and distinct nation from the aspect of nationality, nor from a territorial and historical aspect is it a separate confederate country but a part of Hungary severed from her and in 1848 reunited with her by their joint wish. There is no such thing as a Transylvanian nationality, so the task here is not to seek for a guarantee of a Transylvanian nationality (it being non-existent) against Hungary but to make the nationalities living in Transylvania feel secure about each other.

This particularly concerns the Saxons and the Romanians—and we must remember that in 1848 these nationalities censured and raised objections to the Union.

With respect to the Saxon nation, I should remark that in the structure I have proposed above the Saxon nation would not only keep their institutions of self-government with all the authority that I have expounded under the heading "County Structure" [...] but also keep closer contact based on national and administrative unity and independence that they possessed in the previous centuries, and in fact all these rights could be exercised through their self-government by every inhabitant of the Saxon Territory on the basis of equality before the law and common suffrage, and they could elect their

⁴ Today Petrovaradin, near Novi Sad in Vojvodina (Serbia), in the early modern period it was an important fortress.

senior functionaries independently; in addition, they would elect representatives and senators to both Houses of the Parliament in due proportion.

I propose a similar right of self-government and representation for the Szekler nation.⁵

And as for the Romanians, I am convinced that with the constitutional structure I recommend based on universal suffrage, equality before the law, self-government in townships and counties and parliamentary representation—I am convinced, as I said, that from the aspect of nationality as well as from civic and political aspects, our Romanian kinsfolk in Transylvania cannot but wish for the maintenance of the administrative union of Transylvania and Hungary as it was proclaimed in 1848—and if they weigh their interests soberly, they cannot fail to wish for this. However, if, notwithstanding my expectation, a hostility towards the Union in Transylvania would still manifest itself, I believe it to be befitting the brotherly sentiment of the Hungarian nation not to stick to the letter of the Union accepted by both parties under the impulse of the 1848 revolutions, but to summon the population of Transylvania to decide by means of a referendum to be held on a certain day whether they wish to maintain the union with Hungary or not—and let it be the way the majority would have it.

If the majority takes side against the Union, the Hungarian Parliament would naturally have no right to interfere in the internal affairs and internal government of Transylvania, but it is self-evident that all state authority held until 1848 by the Court of Vienna would be conferred on the Hungarian government and would be exercised from Pest—it being the responsibility of the Transylvanian Parliament elected by common suffrage, that is, by the common will of the Hungarian, Szekler, Saxon and Romanian nations to define the means, manner and organs of the constitutional practice of this state authority.

Lastly, as for our Serbian brethren—who live mixed with our fellow-citizens from other nationalities—just as I do not wish the Hungarian or any other nationality to exercise superiority over them, likewise I presume them to be sufficiently equitable not to wish to exercise superiority over their fellow-citizens speaking different languages.—In fact, the official survey from 1850 shows that in the Serbian voivodeship and the banship of Temes⁶ out of

⁵ The Szeklers, although ethnically Hungarians, were considered a separate '*natio*' in the Transylvanian constitutional tradition.

⁶ Also known as Banat; an administrative entity created by the Habsburg government in the eighteenth century. Its territory is now divided between Serbia and Romania.

the 1,426,000 inhabitants only 384,000 are Serbians—little more than a quarter of the whole.

Thus it is quite conspicuous that here, where Romanians, Serbs, Germans Hungarians, Slovaks, Bulgarians, Jews, Gypsies, Ruthenians, Croatians and Greeks are living together, the demands of the nationalities can only be satisfied by the kind of constitutional system I recommend above, which guarantees for the Serbs under the heading of inviolable individual rights the social unity of their nationality, the right to elect their voivodes, the independent self-government of their Church, and the right to elect their pontiff freely and to endow him with the title of Patriarch if they please—just as it guarantees for them the free use of their language in local and county administration, and even the right to speak in that language at the Parliament; and lastly it guarantees for them equal rights and liberty in every respect.

However, to prove how much I desire that the feuds between the nationalities, which have caused in the past so many calamities and a common servitude in the common homeland, should be replaced by a mutual reconciliation and fraternal harmony: I declare that I do not oppose the transformation of the towns and communities of the Serbian voivodeship and the banship of Temes inhabited by compact masses of Serbs unmixed with other races and their segregation from the neighboring counties, following the examples of the Jászság and the Great and Little Kunság,⁷ or more properly the Saxons of Transylvania—the right to elect its voivode naturally appertaining to the inhabitants of the voivodeship.

I have shown how much I wish that the feuds between the nationalities be settled and that we create anew with a united will a free homeland for all of us without discrimination of language, race and religion.

We have all suffered enough because of the national hatred—we oppressed Hungarians, you others deceived and oppressed together with us. All of us victims deprived of their freedom!

May God grant that all of us may learn from the past.

Translated by Dávid Oláh

⁷ Territorial units in the Great Hungarian Plains, once populated by Iranian and Turkic peoples who moved to Hungary during the Middle Ages and enjoyed specific privileges up to the nineteenth century.

ALECU RUSSO: THE SONG OF ROMANIA

Title: *Cântarea României* (The song of Romania)

Originally published: The first version of the poem was published in *România viitoare* (Paris, 1850). The present form of the poem is as it was published in *România literară* (Iași, 1855), no. 38, 39, 40, 42, 45 and 47.

Language: Romanian

The excerpts used are from Alecu Russo, *Cântarea României* (București: Minerva, 1980), pp. 5–8 and 31.

About the author

Alecu Russo [1819, Strășeni (present-day Republic of Moldova) – 1859, Iași]: writer. His father was a merchant. Between 1829 and 1835, he studied in Switzerland, Germany and Austria. In 1836 he was expelled from school for having contacts with radical circles and for writing revolutionary poetry. For a short period he worked as a merchant in Vienna. Returning home in 1836, he travelled widely in Moldova, collecting folklore and popular poetry. Disowned by his family, he was forced to accept a low-paid job in Târgu-Neamț (Moldavia). During this period he met Vasile Alecsandri (1818–1890), **Nicolae Bălcescu** (1819–1852) and Costache Negri (1812–1876), and began his collaboration with the journal *Piatra Teiului* (The Linden Tree's Stone). In 1846 he had his first plays staged, but because they were critical of the regime of Prince Mihail Sturdza (r. 1834–1849), Russo was exiled to Soveja monastery in Moldavia. He was an active participant in the revolutionary events of 1848. After carrying out a diplomatic mission to Vienna for the revolutionaries in Moldavia, he participated in the national assembly at Blaj (*Hun.* Balázsfalva) on 3–5 May 1848, and the assembly at Lugoj (*Hun.* Lugos) on 15 June 1848. He took an active role among Moldavian refugees in Brașov (*Hun.* Brassó, *Ger.* Kronstadt). He was a member of the committee that produced the 'Declaration of principles for the reform of the country' and the 'Proclamation of the National Party in Moldavia'. After the defeat of the revolution in Transylvania, Russo escaped to Paris. There he participated in the revolutionary activities of the Romanian emigration. In 1850 the first variant of 'The song of Romania' was published anonymously, with an introduction by Bălcescu. Upon his return to Moldavia he became a lawyer in Iași. In 1856, he was appointed director of the Department of Public Administration and in 1857 he became the attorney of the Bank of Moldavia. He also published a number of short but influential essays in the newspapers edited by the Romanian émigrés in

Western Europe, including a rhapsodic account of the Assembly at Blaj. During the Crimean War (1853–1855), the Romanian national cause became an international issue. The Peace Treaty of Paris (1856), which concluded the war, stipulated the creation of national assemblies in Moldavia and Wallachia ('Divanuri Ad-Hoc'). Russo became active in the 'Divanul Ad-Hoc' in Moldavia and held various government posts. He died of ill health less than two weeks after the union of Moldavia and Wallachia in 1859.

Main works: *Critica criticii* (The critique of critique) (1846); *Studie moldovană* (Moldavian study) (1851); *Cântarea României* (The song of Romania) (1855).

Context

The Revolution of 1848 in the Danubian Principalities was mainly the work of liberal intellectuals, or the '48-ers' ('*pașoptiști*'), as they are known in Romanian historiography. They had studied abroad and came to maturity in the 1840s. Their contact with Western Europe proved decisive in shaping their mentality and political visions. They identified civilization and progress with the European societies they visited during their studies.

France played a special role in the process of representing European culture and civilization as the model to emulate within the Danubian Principalities. It was not only French culture that Romanians felt most close to, they also found the French revolutionary model particularly attractive. Moreover, it was in France that the majority of these intellectuals were introduced to modern political ideas. Many Romanians studying in Paris were ardent attenders of the courses offered by Jules Michelet (1798–1874) and Edgar Quinet (1803–1875) at Collège de France, and became friends with prominent French intellectuals such as Alphonse de Lamartine (1790–1869).

As these Romanian intellectuals were not part of the ruling elite in their own countries, the only way they could channel their revolutionary ethos was through cultural associations. They organized various societies to promote 'national culture' and to discuss revolutionary programs. The *Societatea Filarmonică* (The Philharmonic Society), for instance, was established in 1833. It advocated the unification of the two provinces, a true constitution, free education and freedom of the press. Other societies such as *Frăția* ('Brotherhood'), which was founded in 1843 in Bucharest by the historian **Nicolae Bălcescu** (1819–1852), Ion Ghica (1817–1897), a professor of geography at the *Academia Mihăileană* in Iași, and Christian Tell (1808–1884), an officer in the Wallachian army, were even more radical and aimed at preparing the Romanians for a 'universal revolution.'

In addition to organizing secret meetings and discussing the importance of revolutionary change for their societies, these intellectuals were innovative in another field as well. Imbued with a Romantic nationalist rhetoric and political imagery, they devised new descriptions of the nation. These descriptions combined the political tradition of the pre-eminence of individual liberties associated with the French Revolution of 1789 with the cultural revival of the people—the ‘*Volk*’—advocated by Romanticism. The new Romanian nation envisioned by the ‘48-ers’ was part of a universal chain of brotherly nations. At the same time, the cultural definition of the nation, which emphasized the importance of language and ethnic origin, could provide a common framework for Romanian revolutionaries in Moldavia, Wallachia and Transylvania.

The revolution of 1848 in Paris signaled the beginning of a new phase in the evolution of nationalism in Europe. It was also a testing ground for many Romantic and revolutionary ideals of the period. Animated by the revolutionary enthusiasm they experienced in Paris, Vienna or Pest, Romanian students returned to their countries convinced that the freedom of their nation was conditioned upon their activities. Local revolutionary outbreaks erupted in Iași, Blaj, and Bucharest (in April, May and June 1848 respectively). Regional differences and different political contexts played an important role in shaping the revolutionary programs of the Romanians in the Danubian Principalities and Transylvania. They were disconnected, but Romanian revolutionaries from Moldavia, experiencing a revolutionary moment in April 1848, and from Wallachia, especially after the defeat of the revolution in September 1848, also participated in various Romanian revolutionary activities in Transylvania.

The revolution in Moldavia was short-lived. In April 1848 a revolutionary committee petitioned Prince Mihail Sturdza (r. 1834–1849) for civil liberties, a wider franchise and administrative reforms. These demands might have been accepted, but the document also demanded a new national assembly to replace the divan of boyars and the creation of a “citizen guard,” two measures that implied a real shift of power. Prince Sturdza reacted immediately and efficiently. Numerous arrests ensued after the tendering of the petition and the leaders who escaped arrest had to flee the country. Such an inauspicious beginning did not diminish the revolutionary passion of Moldavian intellectuals nor were they deterred from propagating their ideas about the ‘new’ Romanian nation yet to be resurrected from despotic regimes. There are many revolutionary texts which reflect these ideas. Some were produced during the revolution of 1848, such as the ‘Declara-

tion of principles for the reform of the country' and the 'Proclamation of the National Party in Moldavia'; others were written in exile, for example, *Cântarea României*.

Cântarea României fuses the revolutionary and nationalist convictions of the 1848 generation and represents an eclectic synthesis of the main ideas of the time. First, obviously inspired by the Messianic nationalism of the Polish émigré circles, it illustrates the Romantic ideals of purification and suffering. The Romanians had suffered centuries of oppression and exploitation; they thus deserved to be redeemed from their unjust condition as much as any other nation in Europe. Secondly, the text elaborates a form of ethno-cultural nationalism which was prefigured in the writings of Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803). Each nation was unique and had the right to its own territory on the basis of its cultural uniqueness. This territory reflected the physical boundaries of the cultural space shared by the nation.

The powerful imagery Russo used to describe Romania in this poem has further similarities with the Romantic conception of the nation. Russo depicted Romania as an ancient goddess. Since the Revolution of 1789, female revolutionary symbols stood for numerous qualities and virtues. For example, Jules Michelet, in his highly influential *Les Légendes Démocratiques du Nord* (1854), an account of Russia, the Polish lands and the Danubian Principalities, was persuaded by his Moldo-Wallachian disciples to draw a portrait of 'Romania'. Michelet portrayed 'Romania' as a strong, yet frail, woman escaping the despotic oppression of the Turks. At the same time, 'Romania' was described as a country peopled by a sturdy peasantry which embodied the democratic virtues of the land.

In Russo's poem 'Romania' is summoned by the poet to revolt against injustice and exploitation. The situation in the Romanian lands, lamented Russo, is terrible. 'Romania' is deep in misery and misfortune, for while she possesses a great history and splendid virtues, she cannot cultivate them because of foreign and domestic mistreatment. By appealing to all Romanians Russo sought to transgress the narrow definitions of 'Moldavians' and 'Wallachians.' The national space was transfigured by means of biblical imagery, but the salvation of the nation was expected to come not from God but from 'the Sons of the Nation.' The time had come for 'Romania' to wake up from her historical slumber, Russo believed. Russo's poetic expressions created a new nationalist vocabulary rooted in an eschatological form of national devotion.

Based on their ethno-cultural tradition, the Romanians were supposed to join revolutionary Europe. A new era had commenced in Europe, Russo be-

lieved. This new era, by which he meant that dominated by France after the Revolution of 1789 and the Napoleonic wars, brought about transformations so profound as to affect even the remote Romanian lands. Tyranny and oppression were condemned by this 'new voice' coming from the West, which called upon Romanians to rise and fight for their liberty.

Russo is not considered a great writer, but *Cântarea României* occupies a central place in the definition of Romanian national identity. The poem served as a symbol of the revolutionary ethos and the Romantic imagery associated with the Revolution of 1848. During the communist era it underwent considerable manipulation by the 'national communist' propaganda.

MT

The song of Romania

1

Did the Lord of our parents take pity on your tears, you uncomforted people, and did He feel the pain in your chest, my country? Are you not pious enough, tortured enough, and torn apart? Widowed of your brave sons, you weep ceaselessly over their graves, as weep and mourn the women with hair unbound over the mute coffins of their husbands.

2

Nations heard the cry of your torture; the earth is moving. Could God have not heard it? Has the foretold avenger not yet been born?

3

Which one is prouder of all the countries sown by God on earth? Which one puts on more beautiful adornment, and richer grains in summer days?

4

Your hills are green, your forests and your trees hanging on the hillside are beautiful, your sky is clear and cloudless; your mountains rise proudly to the sky; the rivers, like spotted belts, meander in the plains; your night enchants the ears, your day charms the sight. Why is your smile so bitter, my proud country?

5

Have the flowers come out on the Plains of Tenechia?¹ The flowers have not come out yet, these are the herds that graze your valleys; the sun makes the field bear fruit; the hand of the Lord gave you diverse goods, fruits and flowers, wealth and beauty. Why do you moan and shriek, you rich country?

6

The old Danube, conquered by your parents, kisses the seam of your dress and brings you riches from the land where the sun rises and where the sun sets; the eagle in the sky searches you as it searches its land of birth; the beautiful and foamy rivers, the rushing wild streams ceaselessly sing to your praise. Oh, glorious country, like no other, why is your face hidden?

7

Are you not beautiful, are you not wealthy? Do you not have sons that love you? Do you not have books about your bravery in the past, and the future ahead of you? Why are you shedding tears?

8

Why do you jump? Your body melts with weakness, and your heart is tormented – have you looked up the book of witches? The air moves turbidly, the wind scorches you – have you seen the angel of your destruction? Your nights are cold; your dreams are restless like the waves of a sea whipped by storm. What do they foretell you?

9

Look south, look north, people are raising their head; the mind emerges luminously above the darkness. Mind, the godly spirit that constructs, the faith that gives life; the old world is falling, and over its ruins your freedom rises! Awaken!

[...]

61

Old times were stormy but people were born strong. The land was covered in rubble and carcasses, but the plains from which the smoky clouds of

¹ Mythical land described in the popular ballad *Dolca*.

slaughter rose gave off cries of victory and freedom. Wretchedness and death live on, but where are freedom and victory, and the shrieks are only of pain! What would this land have become, had our forefathers slumbered, too?

62

Awaken, Romanian land! Conquer your pain; it is time you shook off your numbness, offspring of rulers of the world! Are you, perchance, waiting for your forefathers to walk out of their tombs? Indeed, they have awakened, and you have not seen them. They spoke, and you have not heard them. Stretch your legs, look and listen; the day of justice is drawing close, peoples have moved and the storm of redemption has risen!

63

Were you not told by the mouth of your martyrs, “And the Lord of your forefathers will take pity on the tears of your servants, and will rise one of you who will restore your descendants back to the bravery and strength that you used to have before”?²

64

So the time has come. There were signs in the sky; the earth shook with joy, a terrible voice has been heard from the west, and all peoples awakened.

Translated by Mária Kovács

² These are the alleged last words of Stephen the Great, Prince of Moldavia (r. 1457–1504).

PETAR BERON: SLAVIC PHILOSOPHY

Title: *Slawische Philosophie* (Slavic philosophy)

Originally published: Prague, Fr. Ehrlich, 1855

Language: German

The excerpts used are from *Славянска философия* (София: Акад. изд. Проф. Марин Дринов, 2000). Part I, Chapter IV and V, pp. 55–58; Part III, 2, Chapter I, p. 191.

About the author

Petar Beron (Pierre Béron) [1800, Kotel (Central Bulgaria) – 1871, near Craiova]: philosopher and pedagogue. He came from a rich merchant's family, and received his primary education in Kotel (in the eastern part of the Balkan mountains) and in Bucharest. In 1824 he published a primer, the so-called 'Textbook with the Fish' (because of the picture on its cover), which had a considerable impact on the Bulgarian educational system as the first modern schoolbook written in the vernacular language. It amounted in fact to a small encyclopaedia for children. Beron continued his studies in Germany, at first in the Faculty of Philosophy at Heidelberg and later in the Faculty of Medicine at Munich, where in 1831 he defended his doctoral dissertation. From the late 1830s onwards he lived in Paris, Berlin, London, Vienna, Prague and Athens, where he continued to work on his extremely ambitious scientific projects. His works in French, German, Bulgarian and other languages cover almost all fields of knowledge: from physics, chemistry and meteorology to history and moral philosophy. He remains a figure of veneration as the first Bulgarian encyclopaedist, a major pedagogical reformer and the first modern Bulgarian philosopher.

Main works: *Буквар с различни поучения* [Textbook with various instructions] (1824); *Slawische Philosophie* [Slavic philosophy] (1855); *Panépistème ou sciences physiques et naturelles et sciences métaphysiques et morales*, 7 vols., (1861–1867).

Context

Even if Beron's scientific works are closely related to contemporary positivistic trends in the sciences, he combines his research interests with the rationalist and humanist ideas of the Enlightenment, which also affected

his cultural program for a national revival (although his direct influence on the Bulgarian national revival is represented primarily by the small textbook he published in his youth). His more fundamental works, written and published abroad, did not influence cultural life in the Bulgarian lands. These books represent a curious mixture of positivism with a type of pantheistic vision that recalls the late Schelling. Beron's terminology was to a large extent a personal invention and because of this, it was hermetic and of little influence.

Arguably, the most important of Beron's scholarly works, the *Slawische Philosophie* can be read as an example in support of the thesis that the 'national project' is essentially related to Romantic philosophy. The most significant element of the work in light of the examination of the process of national identity-building remains the perspective implicit in the title itself. Beron finds the archetypal source of his 'pan-epistemological' project in the 'Slavic idea.' He clearly sought to imply that the Slavic peoples embody the *telos* of history by adopting a new, *scientific* worldview, based upon the 'primordial' propensity of the Slavs to grasp and penetrate into the essence of the world. Like Georgi Rakovski, Beron makes a connection between the mastering of the Slavic/Bulgarian tongue and the access to a scientific worldview, that is, to the ultimate truth. In this sense, even though the text of *Slawische Philosophie* remains absolutely irrelevant on the referential level to the nation-building discourse, it functions performatively as a symptom of the very mechanism of identity-building. It is worth noting, though, that the tendency of the interchangeable use of the terms "Slavic" and "Bulgarian," typical of the Bulgarian Enlightenment, seemed to satisfy a deeper need for solid identification.

Not surprisingly, the indirect impact of Beron's scientific activity turned out to be much more important. Other figures of the 'National Revival' (**Ivan Seliminski**, Liuben Karavelov, Vasil Drumev) regarded it as a strong argument for the quality of the Bulgarian mind. The figure, rather than the works, of the prominent thinker would serve in this period as an incarnation of the national genius. This vision suffered hypertrophy as Ivan Seliminski became convinced that his friend Beron was among the brightest minds of humankind and undoubtedly the initiator of a new era of human knowledge and culture in general. Indeed, Beron himself explicitly shared this conviction: in the 'Preface' of his monumental project of creating a Global Science, *Panépistème*, he proclaimed his Copernican role in the sciences. In this way, Enlightenment beliefs in the sovereignty of the human mind and in positive knowledge find themselves symptomatically and closely related not only to

Pan-Slavic ideology, but also to the creation of a personal myth of the author himself (a fact which provides a strong argument for considering Beron as a transitory figure between the Enlightenment and Romanticism and one of the protagonists of the Romantic project of nationalizing the sciences).

In the extracts cited below, Beron develops his vision of the human races in light of his 'cosmoelectric' theory. Behind the very hermetic and enigmatic para-scientific rhetoric of the text, one can detect a kind of virtual racism, related to the idea of superiority of the white—European—race. All this is integrated into a typically positivist scheme of natural determination. More particularly, Beron describes the Danube and the Balkan peninsula as a corner-stone of European civilization, and it is not difficult to identify the Slavic peoples, and the Bulgarians in particular, as the most advanced and future-oriented sub-group of the European 'race.'

For the most part, Beron's main scientific works remained unexamined (most of them have not even been re-published and/or translated into Bulgarian), which does not allow either for their objective evaluation from a contemporary scientific point of view, or for their interpretation in view of the philosophy of science.

BM

Slavic philosophy

About the creation of the peoples and the spreading of the nations around the world

Furthermore, we have to compare the locations of the people now with those which they would have to take according to the discovered law, in order to see whether these laws are still valid now.

I. Asia, the largest continent, is connected with Europe and Africa and is transected by many large rivers; it is also transected by many mountain chains and is populated by different kinds of plants and animals. In this land were formed the most perfect human races; and when they became too many in their homeland, they resettled to the higher latitudes, because each race was prevented by the neighboring one from moving to West or East or to the Equator.

A. The race which had formed on the west coasts of Asia reached Mesopotamia through the coasts of the Persian Gulf. From that location it did not spread to Arabia, where the Ethiopians and the Abyssinians were already set-

tled, but through the Suez Canal it crossed to Africa and settled on the banks of the Nile, until it was stopped by the migrating to the north of southern African races: then it was forced to resettle in the country's inland.

B. The second more eastern race separated itself from the upper western race, with whom it had wandered in parallel to Suez, and following a northern direction, reached the eastern coasts of the Mediterranean Sea and moved along them till it reached the Bosphorus. The western part of that race began to cross the Bosphorus, while the eastern, following a northern direction, reached the eastern coasts of the Black Sea. The first families to cross the Bosphorus settled on the coasts of the Mediterranean Sea, and also in the inland of the country as far as the Peloponnese. When their migration in that direction was impeded, the next families spread along the west coasts of Black Sea and following them reached the right bank of the Danube. The eastern parts of that race who had separated themselves earlier, followed the route along the east coasts of the Black Sea and after that the Southern Carpathians, where it crossed the Danube and settled in the Carpathians on the right bank of the Danube.

C. The third eastern race reached the Bosphorus in parallel to the second, separating the above-mentioned part of the second race from its main branch, and following this part, it reached the left bank of the Danube, settled in the inland and reached the eastern flank of the Carpathians. Because the right bank of the Danube was already taken, this race did not cross the river but settled along the Carpathian chain until its movement in that direction was stopped by the fourth eastern race. For that reason, the next families were forced to cross the mountain chain and also the river, and in this way, following the region on the right side of the Danube river, this race reached the western Carpathians. Stopped by the mountains, it turned south and reached the coasts of the Adriatic Sea. Its western part settled in the inland of the peninsula, while its eastern part wandered to the area of the Po basin and the Mediterranean coast, until it was stopped by the Alps, which in the end, however, they crossed. Then they migrated to east and west, crossed the Pyrenees, and reached the Atlantic coast.

D. In the east parallel to the third race was a fourth race, which made its way to the north, passed along the west Caspian coasts, crossed the Caucasus and reached the northern mountain-spurs of the Carpathians, where it came across the third race, as has been already described. This fourth race crossed the Carpathians, wandered along the left half of the Danube basin area and reached the Rhine. They migrated inland, and finally reached the coasts of the North and Baltic Seas.

E. Before the third and fourth races reached the western and the northern borders of Europe, the lands between the Danube and the Mediterranean sea were already taken by the most numerous second race, and the next families from the same race were already stopped. And so, they could not migrate either through the Bosphorus or between the Black and the Caspian Sea, because, as we already said, those lands were already taken by the third and the fourth race. For that reason, the families from the second race who arrived were forced to turn to the east, to the eastern coasts of the Caspian Sea, and in that way the third and the fourth races were separated from their families coming after them. In this way the stream of the numerous second race was turned in a direction almost opposite to its initial one. Following the coasts of the Caspian Sea and the basin area of Volga, the second race settled in Eastern Europe and Western Asia, reaching the northern coasts of the continent.

At the time when the second race was diverted from west to east, the migration of the third and the fourth race was interrupted by the next families. The leading families of that race had reached already the Carpathians, and at the time of the divergence of the second race, they were already moving ahead to the western and eastern borders of Europe. In this way the lands between the Black and the Caspian Seas, which they left behind them, were populated by the families which were following them and had already mixed with each other many times.

About the spread of the education among the human races

The first traces of education appeared in the Asiatic races, and specifically in the population of the western and eastern coasts of the continent. The progress of education among the eastern race was hampered because of the scarcity of means of communication with the neighboring western races. So that education was localized on the Chinese coasts and the islands of Japan.

On the other hand, education among the western races originated first in Mesopotamia and from there it spread among the first race in Egypt, where it reached its highest form.

From the first race education was transmitted to the second, who had settled in Asia Minor and in particular on the coasts of the Mediterranean and from there, via its own colonies, on the southern coasts of Europe. With the second race education reached its most advanced form in all fields. That happened because of: 1. The multiple relations and means of communication fostered by the geographical location of the country, and 2. The lack of an-

other comparable culture which might be imitated. The Greek culture is a creation of the Cosmos and the objects of the Cosmos and their elements in the micro-cosmos, therefore it is real.

Education passed from the second race to the third one, and there it reached a high degree, but without being on the level of the second, which was impossible because the culture of the third race was an imitation of the second.

While later the progress of education in Europe slows down, it renews its origin in the east African race, where, having been given back by the second Asian race to the first, it was transmitted by it to the eastern African race, where it reaches a high level.

Later, the education of the second race spread among the third race and from there it passed to the fourth eastern race. The quantity of accumulated empirical knowledge was huge, and remained available and as material for new development when at last the turn of the fifth race came.

This fifth race—in fact this is the second Asian race—without imitating the education of the third and the fourth, and being in direct contact with the vanguards of the third and the fourth races and following its own methods, transcending the natural laws of the phenomena and the causes, was always led by two fluids. These two fluids and the natural laws led to the explanation of all phenomena, which became subject of the different sciences. [...]

Translated by Alena Alexandrova

On pedagogy: III, Didactics

The different types of constitution are no longer guided by the principles of other nations, but are instead accepted by those nations, among which they have to be applied. Therefore, the appropriate constitution shall be adjusted, first of all, to each nation according to its age, and then, according to the other cosmic and geographic conditions. I. Through their orderly life Englishmen save much of their encephalic or vital electricity, as they use this not only for the formation of ideas and manifestations in various arts, but for the formation of such plans and ideas, the implementation of which is aimed at an increase in nutritional resources or welfare. That is why, in this nation, the measure of value is reduced to the unit of the penny. II. The Slavic nation is still in its childhood; it is concentrated in its monarch, the electric currents of the individuals uniting into that of the monarch, whose electricity becomes

one tremendous flow. That is why, for this nation, the monarch is the measure of value, while each individual is evaluated according to the part of this unit he owns. III. The rest of the European nations are at present in their infancy, spending part of their electricity to supply the nutritional resources needed, while the rest of it is used for the formation of various ideals, which find their accomplishment in different arts, poetry, painting and sculpture. Therefore, in these nations there is no solid measurement of value.

I. The image of the English nation is to be found among ants. II. The picture of the Slavic nations, among bees. The picture of the rest of the European nations is to be found among beetles and, in part, among butterflies.

Translated by Elena Alexieva

AHMED MİDHAT EFENDİ: THE BASIS OF REFORM

Title: *Üss-i İnkılab* (The basis of reform)

Originally published: Istanbul, Takvimhane-i Amire Press, 1877

Language: Ottoman Turkish

A transliterated version of the *Üss-i İnkılab* has been published by Selis Books (Istanbul, 2004). The original Ottoman edition was used for the translation provided in this volume (pp. 8, and 36–37).

About the author

Ahmed Midhat Efendi [1844, Istanbul – 1912, Istanbul]: publisher, journalist, novelist, playwright. Born into a family of very modest substance, Ahmed Midhat worked his way up the social ladder to become the most illustrious example of the self-made *Tanzimat* polymath. He started his primary education in Vidin (today in Bulgaria), where his brother served as a government officer, and then moved to Niš (now in Serbia), where he graduated from the secular high school. In 1864, as a protégé of the eminent reformer Midhat Paşa (then the governor of the Danube province), he moved to Rusçuk (Ruse, present-day Bulgaria) as a clerk, where he took Arabic and Persian lessons, learned French, and became acquainted with European literature. By 1868 he was publishing articles in the officially sponsored newspaper *Tuna* (The Danube). In 1869, following Midhat Paşa, he moved to Baghdad, and two years later, returned to Istanbul. Without any form of regular income from the state (which was unusual for an Ottoman intellectual at the time) he supported his family by running a private print shop where he printed and distributed his own books. In 1873, due to his loose affiliation with some members of the Young Ottoman group, he was sent to Rhodes in exile, only to return after the enthronement of Abdülhamid II in 1876. Essentially an apolitical figure, Ahmed Midhat took no further risks and became an avid supporter and publicist of the Hamidian regime. For many years, under the strict censorial measures of Hamidian absolutism, he was able to continue publishing his popular newspaper *Tercüman-ı Hakikat* (Interpreter of Truth). In 1889, he was sent to Stockholm as the Ottoman representative to the Eighth Congress of Orientalists. Devoid of any credibility during the Young Turk era, Ahmed Midhat spent his last years in almost complete obscurity. Ahmed Midhat was indisputably the most prolific writer of his age. Duly nicknamed “the forty horse-power writing machine,” he produced more than a hundred books on almost every genre, from science fiction novels to etiquette manuals to critical essays on history, gender and

religion. The passionate writer's primary agenda was to educate the ordinary Ottoman public and to familiarize them with the fruits (and perils) of modern civilization. Considered to be among the founders of the novel in the Ottoman context, Ahmed Midhat appropriated the Western genre in a highly idiosyncratic fashion, blending it creatively with traditional narrative forms and popular techniques of story-telling. His works generally address the dilemmas and complexities of the process of cultural Westernization brought about by the *Tanzimat*. Troubled by the prospect of over-Westernization, he argued for a balanced reconciliation between the material benefits of Western civilization and the moral values of Ottoman-Islamic society. It is impossible to label Ahmet Midhat solely as a conservative or progressive. Often attuned to the prevailing conformist mood of the Hamidian era, he was still well ahead of his age when it came to certain sensitive issues such as gender equality.

Main works: *Felsefe-i Zenan* [Philosophy of women] (1870); *Yeniçeriler* [The janissaries] (1871); *Eyvah* [Alas] (1871); *Felatun Bey ile Rakım Efendi* [Felatun Bey and Rakım Efendi] (1875); *Menfa* [Exile] (1876); *Üss-i İnkılab* [The basis of reform], 2 vols., (1877–78); *Karnaval* [Carnival] (1881); *Henüz On Yedi Yaşında* [Still only seventeen] (1881); *Mufasssal Tarih-i Kurun-ı Cedide* [A detailed history of the Middle Ages], 3 vols., (1886–88); *Avrupa'da Bir Cevelan* [A tour in Europe] (1889–90); *Fatma Aliye Hanım yahut Bir Muharrir-i Osmaniyyenin Neş'eti* [Fatma Aliye Hanım, or The birth of a female Ottoman writer] (1893–94); *Avrupa Adab-ı Muaşeret-i yahut Alafranga* [European etiquette or 'Alla Franca'] (1894–95); *Jön Türk* [Young Turk] (1910).

Context

The *Üss-i İnkılab* consists of two volumes. The first volume, from which the translated passages are taken, was published during the second year of Sultan Abdülhamid's reign. Starting with a fascinating historical overview about the emergence of the Ottoman polity, the bulk of this volume comprises a detailed account of the political events of the *Tanzimat* years. The second volume, published in 1878, entirely recounts the events of the Hamidian era, publicizing the accomplishments of the new sultan in a celebratory tone. The years in which these two volumes were published mark a critical turning point in late Ottoman history. The first years of Abdülhamid's rule, from the promulgation of the first Ottoman constitution in 1876 to its abrogation by the same sultan in 1878, constitute the culmination, and perhaps the swan song, of the *Tanzimat* era. The 1876 constitution, largely crafted by Ahmed Midhat's mentor Midhat Paşa, was the most articulate legal manifestation of the *Tanzimat* principle of Ottomanism. By declaring that all subjects of the empire, without distinction of ethnicity or creed, are to be recognized as '*Osmanlı*' (Ottoman), the document consummated *Tanzimat*'s ideal of egalitarian citizenship and enhanced its secular concept of the

state. In these years Abdülhamid was careful to act as an avid supporter of the constitution and the new parliamentary system. Thus, in the *Üss-i İnkilab*, he is portrayed by Ahmed Midhat as a magnanimous patron of freedom and equality—as a ruler with the political acumen to finally fulfill the promises of the *Tanzimat*.

Ahmed Midhat begins his first volume with an introductory chapter on the founding years of the Ottoman state. A prelude to the distant medieval past may appear out of place in a book devoted to the period of Late Ottoman reforms, but Ahmed Midhat's strategy resonates well with the Late *Tanzimat* mission of creating a new historical awareness about the period of Ottoman 'origins' as the cradle of a shared and continuous Ottoman identity. For the Ottomans of the nineteenth century who looked back at the founding years of their dynasty, a re-appraisal of the highly syncretic nature of Early Ottoman culture promised to be a pertinent ideological instrument for providing historical legitimacy to the modern ideal of cultural and political syncretism instilled by the *Tanzimat*. A new layer of meaning was added to the reading of Early Ottoman history by the proponents of Late Ottoman reform, which was propelled by their quest for inventing and representing a suitable dynastic-national past. Laced with romanticized overtones and political innuendos, this revised and recharged version of the distant dynastic past helped authenticate and eternalize the *Tanzimat*'s newly contrived models of collective identity and nationality. This revisionist mood oriented towards the past was a necessary step in the process of fabricating a modern Ottoman identity (along European lines) with a historical basis of legitimation. Thus, seeking to rediscover what was viable in the past in order to meet the exigencies of the present, the Late *Tanzimat* elite set out to ascertain the compatibility of traditional Ottoman values with the liberal and 'progressive' ideals upheld by modern Europeans. The most adulated authors, poets and scholars of the second half of the nineteenth century, **Namık Kemal** in particular, helped instill in the public memory a paradigmatic image of early Ottoman society as virtuous, humane, rational, egalitarian—in sum, 'innately modern' in every respect.

Ahmed Midhat's idealized rendition of Early Ottoman society is one of the most articulate efforts to locate historically the Ottoman national "genera." For him, the formative period is significant as it reveals the fundamental tenets of the Ottoman polity in their embryonic and most immaculate form, hence constituting the essential model, or the "basis," for Late Ottoman reform. In the historical outline, Ahmed Midhat identifies the cosmopolitan and egalitarian ideals of *Tanzimat* Ottomanism as the primal and indefatigable

constituents of the “Ottoman imperial edifice,” keeping it intact since the very first days of its foundation. He describes the emergence of the Ottoman state as the dawn of “a new civilization,” brought forth through the unification of various ethnic/religious elements around the ideals of “freedom” and “political fraternity.” In Ahmed Midhat’s text, “Ottomanness” (which, in fact, comprised an elusive identity associated with the ruling elite throughout the centuries prior to the *Tanzimat*) was projected back to encompass the entire history of the Ottoman state. For him, it was a common marker of ‘national identity’ that was wholeheartedly embraced by Muslim and Christian subjects alike since the dawning of the Ottoman age (interestingly Ahmed Midhat fails to mention the Jews in this context, possibly because they did not pose an imminent nationalist threat to the unity of the empire). Defining “compatriotism” as the most vital attribute of the Ottoman past, Ahmed Midhat even intimates that the Christian populations appear to have been the more loyal subjects, in view of the level of Muslim insurgence and duplicity observed through the ages. Mentioning the “seeds of malice” that have been sown among the Christian subjects in the preceding decades, Ahmed Midhat contends that the very threat of nationalist insurgence can only be avoided in the empire by reconfirming the fundamental tenets of Ottoman nationhood; that is, by implementing, to their fullest extent, the principles of freedom and equality. Following the numerous failures of the *Tanzimat* regime, he concludes, this was what Sultan Abdülhamid was about to achieve.

AE

The basis of reform

[Even a cursory overview of the events of Ottoman history would reveal some fundamental tenets of the Ottoman polity:] Firstly, had Ottomanness not been a politically constituted fraternity and nationhood, and all classes of people comprising this assemblage not been content with their political standing, would it have been possible for a tribe of four hundred tents to build a magnificent state in a matter of few years?

Secondly, had the primary mission of the Ottoman state not been to protect and enhance the freedom of the people brought under its rule, and if it were conceived, like many other states that preceded it, to engulf and annihilate the subjected peoples, then would the Ottomans, as the victors and masters of the land, dare to establish the Janissary corps [out of converts] and supply the dominated nations with arms?

[... furthermore], had Ottomanness not been cherished, esteemed and venerated by the Christians as much as the Muslims that belonged to the community, would the Christian Rumelian troops fighting against Timur the Terrible [in 1402] have remained steadfast and displayed such devotion and self-sacrifice, while many Anatolian Muslim soldiers defected to the enemy lines.

[These and many other evidences confirm that], for the civilization of humankind, Ottomanness presents a novel and progressive mode of government and fraternity that has the capacity to satisfy every member of society. Those who join the community, either of their own will or through subjugation, wholeheartedly embrace and recognize Ottomanness as their own political identity, similar to their former religious and communal identities, and do not differ in any way from their fellow Muslim citizens in defending this fraternity under all circumstances. [...]

Today, as in the past, there exist cynics who cast doubt on the beneficial unifying goals and the lofty egalitarian ideals championed by the Sublime [Ottoman] State since the earliest stages of its existence. But certainly all history, to the most mundane events of everyday life, would testify to the fact that we regarded and acknowledged all classes of people comprising the Ottoman community as genuine "Ottomans," and that in turn, *they* regarded *us* in exactly the same terms. Anyone in their right mind would concede that the enlightened objective of modelling our future upon our past would bestow absolute happiness on all Ottoman classes. [...]

To some extent, the seeds of malice that were planted [in the past] to corrupt the non-Muslim subjects have taken root. The efforts of certain harborers of greed and avarice, who nourished these seeds with the water of intrigue, have resulted today in a great catastrophe witnessed by everyone with tears of sorrow. Still, today and in the future, these circumstances are bound to remain too frail to prevail over the firm basis of unity upon which the edifice of Ottomanness rests. Every friend and foe would agree that when, with the help of the Almighty, our period of reform bears its fruits, the initial unity and concord of the Ottoman classes will be fully restored. [...]

[The declaration of the Tanzimat] reconfirmed the condition of equality that constitutes the founding basis of the Ottoman state: All classes of people living under the Ottoman flag, regardless of their religious and denominational affiliations and their communal and racial identities, constitute a unified political nation and are equal beneficiaries of the common law. [...]

Disorder and unruliness, the makers of our contemporary predicament, were engendered by a general disrespect for the laws. The Muslim class, which has always worked hard collectively for the supremacy of the state,

deigned to commit many ungainly acts in order to ravage our imperial edifice. Soon after, instigated by conspiracies, some Christian groups contributed to the devastation of our laudable political fraternity and our blissful nation with the intention to revolt. [...]

[The laws instituted between the reigns of Mahmud II (1808–1839) and Abdülhamid II (1876–1909) do not rest upon a firm basis.] Today, carrying the sincere and progressive intention of regenerating and supporting the Ottoman nation under his rule through the blessings of freedom and equality, Sultan Abdülhamid II granted, with his majestic grace and favor, a constitution that provides a solid base for public laws. With this marvellous law, he laid the foundations of a total process of change, transformation and renovation in the direction of the initial order of our state. [...]

[In the Late Middle Ages], the essential prerequisite for establishing and confirming an imperial edifice possessing the necessary firmness and tenacity—such as the one founded by the House of Osman—was a governing body which would have the capability of bringing various [ethnic/religious] elements together and merging them as an indivisible whole. At that point in history, the institution of such a consolidated polity by any dynasty of Muslim, Turkish or Christian origin, save the Ottomans, remained a distant possibility. The complete and permanent unification of these diverse components, that unprecedented feat of remarkable aptitude and subtlety, was realized, with the grace of God, by the Ottoman House alone. The tangible remains of their rule bear testimony to the inimitable level of this dynasty's conciliatory achievement.

Translated by Ahmet Ersoy

SAMI FRASHËRI: ALBANIA, WHAT IT WAS, WHAT IT IS AND WHAT IT WILL BE?

Title: *Shqipëria ç'ka qënë, ç'është e ç'do të bëhet? Mendime për shpëtimt të mëmëdheut nga rreziket që e kanë rrethuarë* (Albania, what it was, what it is and what it will be? Thoughts on saving the motherland from the perils that beset it)

Originally published: Bucharest, Shoqëria 'Dituria' ('Knowledge' Society), 1899

Language: Albanian

The edition used is *Shqipëria ç'ka qënë, ç'është e ç'do të bëhet* (Albania, what it was, what it is and what it will be), (Tirana: Sh. B. Luarasi, 1993), p. 96.

About the author

Sami Bey Frashëri (Şemseddin Sami) [1850, Frashër (Southeast Albania) – 1904, Istanbul]: linguist, lexicographer, novelist and playwright. The multifarious Ottoman/Albanian intellectual was born in the village of Frashër, then in the province of Yanya (*Gr.* Jannina, *Alb.* Janina). He is the brother of Abdyl (Abdül) Bey (politician) and Naim Bey (poet), two important names in the formation of the Albanian nationalist movement. In 1868, Sami was sent to Zossimea, a Greek gymnasium in Jannina, where he learned ancient and modern Greek, French and Italian. He also acquired fluency in Arabic and Persian by taking private lessons. In 1871, he moved to Istanbul and started working in the Government Press Office as a translator. In 1876, he started publishing the *Sabah* (Morning), one of the most prominent newspapers of the period. In 1872, he authored one of the earliest novels in the Ottoman Turkish language, the *Ta'aşuk-ı Tal'at ve Fitnat* [The love affair of Tal'at and Fitnat], where traditional male-female relationships in Ottoman Muslim society are addressed critically. At the same time, Sami deserves to be called the most important ideologue of the Albanian nationalist movement. Between 1877 and 1881, along with his brother, Abdyl, and other Albanian-born members of the Ottoman elite, he actively participated in the founding of various Albanian cultural clubs and organizations that promoted the rise of national consciousness among Albanians. He was among the founders and an active member of the *Komiteti Shqiptar i Stambollit* (The Albanian Committee of Istanbul) and also the founder in chief of *Shoqëria e të Shtypurit Shkronja Shqip* (The Albanian Printing Association). It was through his inspiration that a new Albanian alphabet was prepared on the basis of Latin and Greek scripts. Sami was indisputably the most competent Ottoman scholar using the Turk-

ish language. His Turkish Lexicon (*Kamus-ı Türki*), still a standard reference for studies involving Ottoman Turkish, was a monumental achievement for its time with its technical rigor and its careful deployment of modern linguistic protocols. A vocal advocate of simplification in language, Sami Bey contributed tremendously to the development of a modern, more vernacular form of academic and literary expression in Turkish. Interestingly, due to his diverse intellectual output and multiple cultural/political allegiances as an “Ottoman Albanian,” Şemseddin Sami is venerated as a significant national figure both in Albania and in Republican Turkey. Sami Bey’s multiple ‘national’ persona is sufficient proof to the complex realities of a multicultural empire imperiled by the ordeals of mounting nationalism.

Main works: *Ta’aşşuk-ı Tal’at ve Fitnat* [The love affair of Tal’at and Fitnat] (1872); *Besa Yahud Ahde Vefa* [Pledge of honor, or loyalty to an oath] (1874); *Kamus-ı Fransevi/Dictionnaire Français-Turc* (1882); *Kamus-ı Fransevi/Dictionnaire Turc-Français* (1885); *Abetare e gjuhës shqipe* [Primer of the Albanian language] (1886); *Shkronjëtorë e gjuhës shqipe* [A grammar of the Albanian language], (1886); *Kamusü’l-A’lam/Dictionnaire universel d’histoire et de géographie* [Universal dictionary of history and geography] (1889–1896); *Shqipëria ç’ka qënë, ç’është e ç’dotë bëhët* [Albania, what it was, what it is and what it will be?] (1899); *Kamus-ı Türki* [Turkish Lexicon] (1900).

Context

The last decade of the nineteenth century was a relatively calm period in the southwest regions of the Balkans. For Albanian activists, though, it was a period of intense agitation. With the opening of the first schools which offered education in Albanian (the first one was established in Korça in 1887), greater efforts were dedicated to education. The Albanian diaspora in Bucharest undertook the important task of supporting these schools materially but also providing a large range of publications. After the founding of *Shoqëria ‘Dituria’* (‘Knowledge’ Society), this activity became institutionalized and more consistent. It was at the printing house of this society that textbooks, literary works and political manifestos were published. However, publication activity was increased also in other regions, where Albanians used to live. In 1897, in Brussels, **Faik Konitza** (*Alb.* Konica) started publishing his review, *Albania*, which became the most significant periodical in Albanian during this period and among the best in the history of Albanian publishing. His vast knowledge was combined with a rare ability in analyzing political events and a spicy writing style.

The educational and publication activity was combined also with a political one, though still not well organized. Thus, in 1899 in Pejë (*Tur.* Ipek, *Srb.* Peć) an attempt was undertaken to found a new Albanian League. The main leader of this organization was a Muslim cleric, Haxhi Zeka, already known

as a main figure in Kosovo during the Albanian League of Prizren (see the *Program of the Albanian League of Prizren*). As a matter of fact, the political program of the new League did not contain significant deviations from that of the Albanian League of Prizren. The main demand was still that of creating an Albanian autonomous *vilayet*. But during the founding meeting, there appeared a controversy regarding the political organization of this future *vilayet*. Most of the participants envisaged this *vilayet* as a unification of the four 'Albanian' *vilayets* (Janina, Kosova, Shkodra and Manastir), while another group, mainly landlords, demanded that the *vilayet* of Salonica (Gr. Thessaloniki, Tur. Selanik, Bg. Solun) should also be incorporated into this entity. Though it was well known that there was no Albanian population living in this area, this demand stemmed from the fact that Albanian landlords possessed a large part of the land in this *vilayet*, mainly in Thessaly. This ambiguity was also present in the documents of the League. From that assembly, two memoranda were sent to the central authorities in Istanbul, each containing different claims. But the reaction of the Ottoman authorities was prompt and severe. After some efforts to resist, the League was crushed.

It was in this historical context that Sami's book was published. The work is divided into three main parts, which refer to the past, the present situation, and the Albanian future. The brief historical account contains a list of some of the stereotypes about Albanian history as they were formulated and presented often by foreign scholars and Albanian intellectuals during the whole nineteenth century. Sami starts with the issue of the origins of Albanians by supporting the theory that the Albanians are descendants of Pelasgic tribes. For him, Alexander the Great and Pyrrhus of Epirus were Pelasgs, i.e. ancestors of the Albanians. Sami refers to the Illyrian tribes without relating them to the Albanians, which means that at that time the theory of the Illyrian origin of Albanians was not so popular as it is today. Following a chronological order, Sami focuses on the arrival of the Ottomans in the Balkans and the consolidation of Ottoman rule in the peninsula. Moreover, in his work, central place is given to Gjergj Kastrioti Skënderbeu (Skanderbeg), who is depicted in a romantic manner and idealized as a national hero. The figure of Skanderbeg was crucial for the cultural and national identification of the Arbëresh, the population of Albanian origin, which had lived in southern Italy since the fifteenth century. For them, Skanderbeg was the main hero of a glorious past, the only and unique leader of the Albanians, and, finally, a continuous point of reference in their popular songs or in any other cultural activity. The Skanderbeg era provided the poetic material for some of the main Arbëresh poets such as Jeronim De Rada or Gavril Dara i Riu, whose poems

lie at the foundations of modern Albanian literature. But in Albania itself, he was merely a local hero whose name was involved in legends and tales especially in the region of Kruja. Nevertheless, due to the enormous role of the Arbëresh intelligentsia in the 'Albanian Awakening,' Skanderbeg soon became a symbol of the whole Albanian movement. Naim Frashëri, Sami's brother, wrote an epic poem dedicated to him, which soon became used as a textbook. In his description of Skanderbeg, Sami follows the poetic style of his brother. However, Sami does not criticize Ottoman rule. On the contrary, he emphasizes the central position of the Albanians in the Ottoman Empire until the introduction of the reforms in 1839, and the fact that a large number of Ottoman high officials were of Albanian origin.

Contrasted to the 'glorious past,' Sami presents the political stagnation, economical under-development, cultural obscurantism and the absence of a vernacular education system—the main features of the Albanian reality of that period. In his view, the political and especially economic status of the Albanians deteriorated following the introduction of the *Tanzimat*. Corruption had increased, coupled with economic decline, and the Albanians lost their influence. The political impact of the national ideologies of the neighboring nations complicated the situation even further. Following the example of the Albanian League of Prizren, Sami defined the main aims of the Albanian League of Pejë as the achievement first of political autonomy and later on of full independence.

Sami dedicates the third part of his work to the question of the organization of a future Albanian state. It was the first time that such a detailed political, economical, and social program has been elaborated in Albanian by an Albanian born ideologue. According to Sami, the political organization of this state was supposed to follow the republican principle. At the top of the executive power, Sami envisioned a Council, which would hold competences similar to those of the President in other states. But the real executive power would remain in the hands of a cabinet headed by a prime minister. The legislative power would lie with the General Council—an assembly similar to a Parliament—whose members would be elected by the people. Sami foresaw a reform in the field of education by creating a general educational system, based on gender equality (a revolutionary step if we consider the very low position of women in Albanian society at that time), the development of industry and economy, the foundation of a university, and reforms in several cultural domains.

This work was the most articulate program of the Albanian Revival and had a strong influence among Albanian intellectuals. Very soon after its pub-

lication the book was translated into other languages. In 1904, Shahin Bey Kolonja (1865–1919), another leading Albanian activist of the period, translated Sami's book into Ottoman Turkish and published it in *Drita* (The Light), a fortnightly that Kolonja edited in Sofia, between 1901 and 1908. An Albanian reprint of Sami's book and its translation into Greek was published in 1907, again in Sofia. Further on, a German translation was published in 1913, in Vienna.

In independent Albania, Sami's book was regarded as the fundament of Albanian identity. Enver Hoxha once wrote that during the whole Second World War he kept this book in his bag, finding in it a great source of inspiration. After the war, when a new version of Albanian history was imposed, Albanian historians interpreted Sami's account on the wonderful Albanian-Turkish coexistence before the *Tanzimat* only as an attempt of the author to avoid the reaction of the Ottoman authorities. But this interpretation seems rather unfortunate. As many among the Albanian notables as well as other activists of Muslim origin, Sami was truly convinced that the Albanian population was better off before the implementation of the *Tanzimat*. On the whole, the romantic and manipulative treatment of history, characterizing especially the first part of Sami's work, never became the object of critical scrutiny. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that this work played a crucial role during the final phase of the Albanian Revival and became an inspiration for the new independent Albanian state established in 1912.

RH

**Albania, what it was, what it is and what it will be?
Thoughts on saving
the motherland from the perils that beset it**

[...] Albanians speak one of the oldest and most beautiful languages of the world. The languages contemporary to, or sisters of the Albanian language, became extinct a thousand years ago, leaving but fragments behind. Albanian is contemporary to Ancient Greek, Latin, Sanskrit, and the language of Ancient India, as well as the language of Ancient Persia, Celtic, Ancient German, etc. Among the above-mentioned languages, however, some were the little sisters of Albanian, and some the younger; a lot of them have not been spoken for thousands of years and have no life outside old books. They are called "dead languages," while our native Albanian, though just as ancient as they are, is alive and spoken nowadays as it used to be in the time of Pelasgs,

who were Albanians just like us but disappeared since they forgot their language. The current inhabitants of the country called Albania, however, retained their language very well and kept the old language of legendary Pelasgs spoken to the present.

How did it happen that Albanians were able to preserve their language during all these barbarian times? How was it possible that the Albanian language survived without changes or damage despite the lack of letters, writing, and schools, while other languages written and used with great care have changed and deteriorated so much that they are now known as other languages? The answer to all these questions is very simple: Albanians preserved their language and their nationality not because they had letters, or knowledge, or civilization, but because they had freedom, because they always stood apart and did not mix with other people or let foreigners live among them. This isolation from the world, from knowledge, civilization and trade, in one word, this savage mountain life allowed the Albanians to preserve their language and nationality.[...]

In the North, Albania borders on Montenegro, Novi Pazar and Austrian-ruled Bosnia, and finally upon Serbia, in the East on Macedonia, in the South-East on Greece, and in the West and South-West on the sea that separates Albania from Italy and civilized Europe. The place contained between those borders is Albania, our lovely motherland. It is one of the most beautiful countries in Europe. Maybe it is not very rich, but it is really very beautiful. [...] Its population amounts to around 2 million people or maybe more. From them some 100,000 are Vlachs, who live mostly in the Pindos Mountain and a few other places, about as many are Greeks living around Janina, and also Slavs inhabiting the Monastir¹ valley and in some parts of Kosova. But even these people could be Albanians who have forgotten their language and have learned Greek or Slav languages at school or in church. Many of them do not possess any land or homes, because they are just tenants on someone else's land who were brought to these territories when Albanians could not leave the rifle to take up the plough. All other people in Albania are simply Albanians, divided into Geg and Tosk. The Shkumbin river separates Gegëria in the North from Toskëria in the South, but even in the South there are some Gëgs and one can occasionally hear the Geg dialect. Between Gëgs and Tosks there are no significant differences. All are the same nation and speak the same language with some small differences, which will soon dis-

¹ Today's Bitola, Republic of Macedonia.

appear after the introduction of a literary language. From a religious point of view two-thirds of the Albanians are Muslims and one third are Christians. Half the Christians are Catholics, or as we say Latins, and half are Orthodox. The Christians in Gegëria are Catholics and in Toskëria they are Orthodox. Muslims are also divided into Sunnites and Bektashi. [...] Apart from Albanians living within Albania, there is about half a million of Albanians living abroad—in Italy, Greece, in different parts of Turkey, Montenegro etc. Among them, the Albanians in Greece and Italy are the most numerous. Those living in Greece left Albania before the coming of the Turks, during the Byzantine period: they fled the invading Huns and other tribes that came from the North and overran all of Albania. Then thousands of Albanians left their motherland and moved to Morea, Attica and other different regions of Greece. [...] Most of the people living in Attica are Albanian; before it became the capital of the Greece, Athens was just a simple Albanian town and no other language but Albanian was heard there. [...] In Italy the Albanians live in Calabria and Sicily in their own villages or regions, separate from the Italians and preserving their language and faith as many among them are Orthodox. There are around 300,000 people in Italy who are Albanians in blood and language. They left Albania after the death of Skanderbeg, when Albania fell in Turkish hands. Many other Albanians left the country at that time and moved to different places around Europe, but they all have been lost without a trace after losing their language and mixing with the local population. [...]

Albania was once a rich and prosperous country. Albanians earned their living by serving in the army, plundering the conquered territories or by practising several professions. [...] This is no more the case; Albanians do not earn money in the army, but are forced to enroll; they do not return with gold-plated clothes and beautiful guns, but come home naked, sick and poor. European competition has thwarted Albanian production. What little money Albanians earn disappears into the hands of the European merchant. Government taxes are high and hardly payable. [...] There is no good government in Albania. Day after day Albanians fight against each other, wasting Albanian blood, the blood that should be saved for the defense and salvation of our motherland.

[...] The only aim of Albanians is to defend their country from being divided among its neighbors, to preserve its language and nationality, to resist the intrigues of their enemies, and finally to stop the infusion of the Greek and Slavic languages and propaganda, which are destroying the very essence of Albanian and Albanians. Every true Albanian will fight against any attempt to stop us in achieving these aims. Every possible means will be used.

The first problem is language. There cannot be an Albania without Albanians; there cannot be Albanians without their language, and no Albanian language without an Albanian alphabet and schools, where Albanian will be taught. Therefore, our first goal is the language; the Turkish government should be forced to allow Albanians to learn their native tongue, to permit the opening of Albanian schools and the entry of Albanian books into the country. Any Albanian should first learn to read and write in Albanian, and only then should he flex his tongue with other languages. The second problem is the church. Albanians should have their own church, independent from the Greek or Slavonic churches, they should have their Albanian priests and should be able to read the Bible in Albanian, because Christ was neither Greek nor Slavonic. Unfortunately, this is impossible without replacing the present government with a new one that would be friendlier to Albanian efforts. Albanians need a government that would keep its eyes wide open unlike the blind rulers of today. What matters is how good our rulers are, not what names they bear. This is what Albanians strive for.

Such government is as necessary for Albanians as bread and water. Without such a government they will not be able to resuscitate and spread their language, nor defend their nationality.

Our boundaries should be delimited as soon as possible, because it is vital to know what Albania is and what it is not. European recognition is necessary as well. Albanians should perfect their knowledge and books for the benefit of their language; they should unite their efforts and appear as one nation in one country. Then, even if there is a war on the Balkan Peninsula and Turkey is defeated, Albania will stand on its own feet; no one will be able to either harm or split it. For the time being, however, this government shall pledge allegiance to the Empire as Albanians have been shedding their blood for the Porte for 500 years and they would certainly regret its fall; and yet they are aware that the Ottoman Empire is trying to destroy them and to disperse them among their enemies. Albanians will give their blood for this kingdom to the end, and they will keep their word as they always have. Under a good government they will become stronger and of even greater help to Turkey. But if Turkey does not change its attitude and continues to risk its security even in the face of its demise, as has so often been the case, then Albanians will try to save their minds and not lose themselves with this mad state that beckons death despite knowing well enough how to save itself.

Translated by Rigels Halili

MARKOS RENIERIS: WHAT IS GREECE? WEST OR EAST?

Title: *Τί εἶναι ἡ Ἑλλάς; Δύσιν ἢ Ἀνατολή* (What is Greece? West or East?)

Originally published: in the review *Ἐρανιστής*, B, 1, Athens, 1842, pp. 189–215

Language: Greek

The excerpts are from pp. 204–214.

About the author

Markos Renieris [1815, Trieste – 1897, Athens]: lawyer, philologist and historian. After completing secondary education in Venice, he studied law at the University of Padua. In 1835 he moved to Athens and started working as a lawyer. In 1839, as a lawyer, he defended Theofilos Kairis, a well-known clergyman who was accused of heresy. Later, he was appointed a judge, a position he retained until 1844, when he was dismissed due to the decision of the National Congress regarding *heterochthones* (see **Ioannis Kolettis**, *Of this Great Idea*). In 1842 he participated in the publication of the review *Ἐρανιστής* (Collector). Between 1853 and 1858, together with other prominent intellectuals, such as **Constantinos Paparrigopoulos**, Alexandros Rangavis and Nikolaos Dragoumis, he published and directed the francophone review *Spectateur de l'Orient*, which aimed at popularizing the Greek position during the crucial period of the Crimean War. In its pages he published extensively on political issues. His works on the Eastern Question earned him a reputation as an expert on foreign politics. This encouraged him to submit a memorandum to King Otto regarding what policy he should follow. Otto very much appreciated his views and appointed him ambassador to Constantinople (Istanbul). According to the ‘ethos’ of the period, Renieris participated in ‘irredentist’ activities as well. During the Cretan uprising of 1866–69, for instance, he was elected a member of the central committee of Cretans in Athens. For his services he was decorated by King George I. Renieris belonged to the group of intellectuals who had studied in the West and supported the Western cultural orientation of the Hellenic state. Even though he later shifted to the anti-Western camp, he has always been considered, together with intellectuals from the Ionian Islands such as Iakovos Kozakis-Typaldos, as a pioneer of the pro-European and secular cultural tradition in Greece.

Main works: *Φιλοσοφία τῆς Ἱστορίας. Δοκίμιον* [Essay on the philosophy of history] (1841); *Τί εἶναι ἡ Ἑλλάς; Δύσιν ἢ Ἀνατολή* [What is Greece? West or East?] (1842); *Κύριλλος Λούκαρις, Ὁ Οἰκουμενικός Πατριάρχης* [Cyril Loukaris, the Ecu-

menical Patriarch] (1859); *Ιστορικάί μελέται, ὁ Ἑλλήν πάπας Ἀλέξανδρος Ε', τό Βυζάντιον καί ἡ ἐν Βασιλείᾳ σύνοδος* [Historical studies: the Greek pope Alexander V, Byzantium and the Synod of Basel] (1881); *De l'avenir du peuple grec et de la langue Grecque* (1864); *Περὶ Βλοσσίου καὶ Διοφάνου, ἔρευναι καὶ εἰκασίαι* [On Blossios and Diophanes, research and conjecture] (1873); *Μητροφάνης Κριτόπουλος καὶ οἱ ἐν Ἀγγλίᾳ καὶ Γερμανίᾳ φίλοι Αὐτοῦ (1617–1628)* [Mitrofanis Kritopoulos and his friends in England and Germany] (1893).

Context

With the foundation of the Hellenic state and the nomination of the Bavarian Prince Otto as the first king of Greece in 1832, the obsession with antiquity, already widespread among the Greeks, became the core of state policy. The glory of the ancient Greeks was assumed to provide inspiration on the path to cultural, political and administrative development. It might seem paradoxical that attachment to ancient culture could be thought to contribute to a modernizing project. However, this paradox can be resolved if we consider the pro-European character of this discourse. The new state did not attach itself to the immediate past, as it had been preserved in the popular memory, but rather adapted itself to the convenient image of the ancient Greek past already created in the West. Otto's father, King Ludwig I of Bavaria, was obsessed with ancient Greece and brought up his children with the aspiration that one day one of them would reign over this glorious land. In line with these notions, upon Otto's arrival the capital of the state was transferred from Nafplion (in the north-western part of the Peloponnese) to Athens, an insignificant town at that time.

In the meantime, the local Church severed its bonds with the Patriarchate of Constantinople in 1833 and declared itself autocephalous. For this the supporters of the autocephalous Church and, above all, the Bavarian administration became the targets of harsh criticism from religious circles. The main argument was that the Greek nation had been thereby detached from its Orthodox tradition and forced to adopt a pagan Hellenic heritage initiated by 'Luthero-Calvinists,' a term widely used in Greece during the nineteenth century. Eventually, the *Συνοδικὸς Τόμος* (Synodic Tome) published by the Patriarchate in 1850 recognized the autocephalous status of the Church of Greece and made reconciliation possible.

In fact, religious authority was the subject of intense debate. Whereas the clergyman and theologian Theoklitos Pharmakidis, who had argued for the necessity of the creation of an autocephalous Church, was an Anglophile and

a liberal, the main Orthodox ideologue, Constantinos Economos, was a conservative and a supporter of Russian influence. For all that, Pharmakidis should not be regarded as a separatist nationalist opposing the ecumenical values of Orthodoxy; neither should Economos be regarded as a supporter of those values against nationalism. The clash between the two culminated in the trial of Theofilos Kairis. A clergyman and teacher, Kairis became famous for running a school in Patmos which relied largely on the classical tradition. Despite his popularity, Kairis was accused of heresy and his school was closed down.

It is within this atmosphere that Markos Renieris became involved in public debates. That he became one of Kairis' lawyers is a strong indication of his liberal views. His first publications were dominated by the search to prove the Western affiliation of Greek culture. His essay, 'What is Greece? West or East?', provided a coherent answer to the question he posed in the title. The author argues that if Greece belonged to the East, by accepting Western influence it would deny its national character. However, since it belongs to the West, then it simply re-appropriates, through Western mediation, its own ancient culture. In order to sustain his thesis, Renieris uses historical arguments. Greece, he claims, was the model for the West. Then Christianity, through its ecumenical appeal, managed to unify the East with the West. Byzantium, however, represented something totally alien to the West, a despotic Eastern regime which suppressed the Western nature of Hellenism, leading to its decay. The author finally concludes that Greece, by its resurrection, holds the promise of leading a reconstruction of the East.

However, the proliferation of the 'Great Idea' in Greek public opinion after 1844 (see **Ioannis Kolettis**, *Of this Great Idea*), which led to the unfortunate Greek participation in the Crimean War (1853–56) on the Russian side, altered the international environment radically. To their dismay, the Greeks saw the Western powers supporting the Ottoman Empire against Orthodox Russia. Thereupon, certain circles sought to reconsider their cultural attachment to the West and develop a more emancipated discourse. Prominent among them, Renieris turned into a fervent supporter of the Greek claims against Western hostility and lack of understanding. In his essay, *Le dualisme grec*, published in 1853, Renieris argued that the Greek nation was not regenerated thanks only to Western influence. There was also the need for a solid local cultural element, which was provided by the tradition of the *κλεφταρματολοί* (banditry) and religion. Hence this duality in the formation of modern Greek culture. Renieris asserted now that both Western and Eastern civilization had derived from the Hellenic one, and thus there was no di-

lemma: "The Hellene is the most ecumenical human being; he is the only real European." As a matter of fact, Renieris denounced his old ideas and joined the trend that supported the 'pro-Eastern version' of Greek nationalism.

Renieris' change of perspective mirrored, in intellectual and political terms, the drama of a whole generation. The confident answer that "Greece belongs to the West," offered in the 1830s and 1840s, was shaken by the realization in the 1850s that the "West has changed its mind." However, the pro-Western version of Greek nationalism did not disappear, and built its argument on the assumption that the Greeks themselves had abandoned the ideals for which Europe admired them. In a leaflet published in 1854 under the title *Ελληνισμός ἢ Ρωσσισμός?* (Hellenism or Russianism?), Constantinos Dossios, himself an Anglophile, defended the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, following Pharmakidis' tradition, Dossios condemned the expansionism of the Russian Empire and claimed that the only way the Greek race, a significant component of the Ottoman Empire, could survive and prosper was through the reformation of the Ottoman state.

In the twentieth century, the political attachment to the West was never really challenged, although in cultural terms conservative intellectual circles expressed their scepticism towards Western liberalism and individualism, which in their view did not coincide with the Greek-Orthodox tradition. Even the Church itself, which used to identify the West with Catholicism and Protestantism and even today occasionally adopts an anti-European stance, would eventually abide by the famous statement of Constantinos Karamanlis, one of the most prominent politicians of the second half of the twentieth century, that "We belong to the West." This Western orientation was partly due to the fact that after the Russian revolution, the Orientalist discourse was taken up by the Greek Communists who, like Economos a century before, saw the Russians as their natural allies against "Anglo-American imperialism."

VK

What is Greece? West or East?

[...]

It is obvious that the Byzantine polity described by us above was at variance with the heavenly Christian polity. While the God sitting on the heavenly throne was the god of love, the king holding the throne on earth governed his subjects by fear and by the iron staff of despotism; while people were the children of god, they were the king's most humble slaves; while they sensed their worth before the heavenly god, they had to annihilate them-

selves before his earthly representative; in a word, while in the heavens there existed a Christian polity, on earth there flourished an Asiatic polity.

This contradiction could not last for very long; logic, which is the supreme governor of all things, was bound to destroy it. And in the West, where the ecclesiastical element was found, for reasons which it is not possible to expound here, to be more powerful than the cosmic one, the ecclesiastical polity, a depiction of the heavenly one, gradually shaped the cosmic polity in its image.

[...] In Byzantium, however, where the kingdom had preserved a strong influence over the church, the complete opposite had to take place; heaven had to comply with earth, in such a way that the king could see in it, as in a mirror, his absolute power.

But to this end, Christianity would have to take refuge in Judaism; the god of love, the god of the New Testament would have to become the severe and implacable god of the Old Testament; human individuality having been annihilated in society, it would have to be annihilated in the temple as well; and, in turn, art, from painting to the architectural form, would retrogress; in a word, emperors would have to become iconoclasts.

[...] It is no wonder, therefore, that in the time of the Crusades, during which Europe and Greece first came in communication with each other, a mutual hatred seized both Byzantines and Crusaders; the opposite result would indeed have been a wonder. Moreover, this hatred had to bring about as a natural consequence the destruction, through the Crusades, of the Byzantine kingdom.

[...] And thereupon Greece, which had hitherto been hermetically sealed from Western civilization, was at once flooded with the institutions and customs of the West.

[...] Oh, how different the fate of Greece would have been, if these chivalrous virtues had been permanently grafted onto Hellenic civilization! If those days had seen the marriage between the West and Greece!

But divine providence had commanded otherwise; Greece, this homeland of Reason, could only return to the society of Western nations through Reason and not through violence and conquest; through the pen of Korais and not through the medieval knight's spear.

That is the reason that the age of chivalry passed without leaving a single trace, without modifying the Hellenic character in the slightest way.

[...] How could these foreign elements be received in Greece, when Hellenic literature itself, the glorious heritage of their ancestors, had become foreign in their homeland?

[...] We may wonder whether certain writers, in order to explain historically this change and decline in the Hellenic spirit, were forced to assume that the old race had been utterly uprooted and replaced by some foreign, oriental race.

[...] While the people, in terror, raised their hands to the Almighty and said: "Would that the city be delivered into the hands of the Latins, who acknowledge Christ and the Mother of God, and would that we not be thrown into the hands of the impious"; one of the great ones, the Grand Duke, stood up and called out: "It is better to see the fez of the Turks reigning in the middle of town than the Latin head gear."¹

The wish came true; the Byzantine age, after having collected its last powers in order to deliver its final curse against the West, was wiped off the book of life by the blood-thirsty sword of Mohammed. The end!

[...] But such a study is beyond the scope of the subject at hand; it is sufficient to us to be assured that it was under the influence of two great elements that this rebirth of the Hellenic nation began, continued and was fulfilled.

The first element is undoubtedly our Orthodox religion; it is this that we should credit with the preservation of our language and nationality; it was by virtue of this that the seal of immortality was imprinted on the forehead of the Hellenic people.

But this was not sufficient; religion merely preserved. Meanwhile, the nation also needed progress in order to emerge from its pitiable state. This second element consisted of the ideas of the West.

Internal persecution, commerce, the desire for education—these at times obliged the most select part of the Hellenes to visit the kingdoms of the West. There, in their daily communication with Westerners, they gradually divested themselves of their Byzantine petty arrogance and their aversion to the West. Moreover, upon returning to their homeland and comparing the state of the nation to that of Western European peoples, they sensed their deep decline, but at the same time conceived the hope of rebirth.

As for Hellenic letters, they were the instrument for the reconciliation between Greece and the West, since it was because of these [Hellenic letters] that the Westerners held dear the children of such ancestors, while the Greeks themselves, through the study of these letters, regained their ancient sense of

¹ According to the legend, this statement was made by the Byzantine Loukas Notaras. It echoed the views of a large part of the Byzantine nobility and the clergy which rejected the unification of the Eastern with the Western Church.

liberty and glory, became *Franks* in the etymological sense of the word, and were fully convinced that the new European ideas which were entering Greece were not completely alien, but a result of the grafting of Hellenic letters on Western society.

[...] And while Korais was setting the foundation of this great endeavor in Paris, the last seeds of the Byzantine spirit, being under attack from the new Western ideas, were forming another school opposed to that of Korais. The character of this school is [marked by] an aversion to the West inherited from the Byzantines; and while this school is much to be commended for its strict dedication to the Orthodox Eastern Church, nevertheless its religious zeal is not inspired by a feeling of Christian love, it does not comprehend the movement of the century, and in consequence of this, it looks upon all works of the Western mind as hostile and as scheming against our holy religion.

Here then, even before the revolution, are the two parties, the new Dorians and Ionians of a free Greece, preparing themselves; and here, even before the revolution, the two angels of the East and West wrestling over the infant to be born.

The infant has already been born; let us listen with religious care to its first cries, in order to learn which one of the two fighters has won, which one of them will give it a name.

A peculiar infant indeed! It has just been born and the whole world is moving; it has just been kissed by the rays of the sun and, like a new Hercules in swaddling-clothes, it chokes with its tender hands the terrible dragons of Ottoman tyranny; it has just emitted its first cry, and this cry is the constitution of Epidaurus.²

And what is this cry saying? Does it continue to curse the West, as did the dying Byzantium? Of course not; rather, it repeats in the language of Demosthenes the liberal principles, the ones which the Assembly in France included in that famous declaration of the rights of man. These principles, which Western Europe, after shedding rivers of blood, had only just succeeded in inscribing in its codes and making understood to its people, the newly reborn Greece [at once] understood and proclaimed; they appeared as the first spontaneous thought of the new infant. For while in Europe these [principles] appeared as a *deus ex machina*, as something supernatural, which was able to take root among the people only after a long struggle, in Greece

² The first and most democratic constitution voted by the revolted Greeks in Epidaurus in the north-eastern part of the Peloponnese in 1822.

they appeared as something as natural and necessary as the rising and setting of the sun.

Greece, then, was named by herself, as soon as she was reborn, a child of the West, and did not even remember that between herself and the West there had once existed unrelenting enmity. The Hellenic heroes fought together with the European philhellenes in the battlefields of glory; the blood which was spilled sealed the new union between Greece and the West.

[...] We consider that all that has been expounded so far is adequate to answer the question posed at the start; we consider sufficiently proved that Greece, according to its nature, its civilization and its historical mission, belongs to the *West* and not the *East*; that in the times of decline and corruption, under the Byzantines, [Greece] appeared to be forgetting herself and to be transformed into her opposite; but having been reborn, she returns as a shining star to her ancient course and promises to become the leader of the West in the moral conquering and reforming of the East.

In light of the above it is further manifest how unfounded are the following claims by Mr. Fallmerayer³ upon which he constructed his infamous system; that, supposedly, *the true nature of those who are now called Hellenes consists in their aversion to and contempt for the dogmas, the character and the customs of the West*; that *between them and the Europeans, nature has erected an eternal partition*.

This author's incomplete knowledge of things Hellenic made him perceive certain relics of the Byzantine era and its superstitions against the West as constituting the genuine character of Hellenism.

Translated by Mary Kitroeff

³ Jakob Philipp Fallmerayer (1790–1861) was an Austrian traveler and historian who became particularly unpopular among Greeks when, in his works on the medieval history of Greece, he argued that modern Greeks were of Albanian and Slavic descent. His theory triggered numerous responses which paved the way for the formation of modern Greek national ideology.

VIKTOR VON ANDRIAN-WERBURG: AUSTRIA AND HER FUTURE

Title: *Österreich und dessen Zukunft* (Austria and Her future)

Originally published: Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1843

Language: German

The excerpts used are from Madeleine Rietra, ed., *Wirkungsgeschichte als Kulturgeschichte. Viktor von Andrian-Werburgs Rezeption im Vormärz* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2001), pp. 215–216, 217, 288–289.

About the author

Viktor Franz von Andrian-Werburg [1813, Görz, (today Gorizia, Italy) – 1858, Vienna]: politician and writer. He belonged to an old aristocratic family from Görz. After completing his basic education, he studied law in Vienna. In 1834 he began his career in the civil service working for the Austrian ‘Gubernium’ in Venice. In the early 1840s, Andrian-Werburg published two works important for the evolution of his political career, *Österreich im Jahre 1843* and *Österreich und dessen Zukunft*. Both of them criticized the political system in Austria. In 1844 Andrian-Werburg became a secretary at the Imperial Chancellery, a position he abandoned in 1846. During the Revolution of 1848 he became an active politician, supporting the reformist movements and the interests of ethnic minorities such as the Czechs. He was a member of the ‘Frankfurt Parliament’ (May 1848–May 1849), where he advocated the ‘*Großdeutsch*’ idea (Greater Germany with Austria as the leader) instead of a ‘*Kleindeutsch*’ one (Germany with Prussia as the leader). After the defeat of the revolutions of 1848 in Germany and Austria, Andrian-Werburg worked as a political commentator. He was a fervent critic of the neo-absolutist regime of Alexander von Bach (1813–1893), instituted after 1849. In his *Centralisation und Decentralisation in Österreich* (1850), he discussed the centralization policies of the post-1848 period and their effect on Austrian political and national life, and insisted that the state should respect the autonomy of the individual regions and their rights to internal legislation. Many of his ideas were reflected in the ‘October Diploma’ introduced by Francis Joseph (r. 1848–1916) in 1860. In addition to his impact on constitutional history in Austria, Andrian-Werburg’s theory of federal nationalism was constantly invoked in the discussions about the future of Austria and its relationship with other ethnic groups which characterized the last decades of the Habsburg Empire.

Main works: *Österreich im Jahre 1843* [Austria in 1843] (1843); *Österreich und dessen Zukunft* [Austria and Her future] (1843); *Centralisation und Decentralisation in*

Österreich [Centralization and decentralization in Austria] (1850); *Denkschrift über die Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsfrage in Österreich im Jahre 1851* [Memorial on constitutional and administrative questions in Austria in 1851] (1851, published in 1859).

Context

Two clusters of ideas characterized political thinking in Austria in the period preceding the revolution of 1848. The first dealt with the rise of nationalism amongst the ethnic groups of the Empire; the second discussed the future of Austria in Central Europe and its relationship with Prussia. Metternich's political system had an impact on the evolution of both of these themes. However, to many critics of Metternich's policies, his combination of diplomatic strategies designed to enhance Austria's international credentials through the suppression of internal national movements jeopardized the existence of the Austrian Empire. According to these authors, one could not imagine the future of Austria without a feasible solution for the domestic rise of conflicting nationalisms. Moreover, the political fragmentation of the German states of the former Holy Roman Empire, and Prussia's intention to dominate the future of these states fueled additional debates in Austria.

In the 1840s–1850s, various writers in the Austrian Empire, such as **József Eötvös** (1813–1871), **František Palacký** (1798–1876) and Viktor von Andrian-Werburg, argued that the domestic problems of Austria could not be dissociated from external developments, such as the creation of a German state under the leadership of Prussia. The Austrian Empire, according to these authors, was facing a critical moment in its modern history. On a general level they combined ideas of public reform, such as a new constitutional arrangement for Austria, with concepts of national equality and liberty for the ethnic groups of the Empire. On a particular level, however, their theoretical and political interests tended to illustrate their national affiliation. Eötvös and Palacký perceived the Austrian Empire as a protector of the ethnic diversity in Central Europe and the only force capable of blocking Russia's expansion. However, they had connected the stability and consolidation of the Austrian Empire with the national recognition of their ethnic groups. If Hungarian and Czech national leaders resorted to well-established traditions of national identification, German writers in Austria faced serious conceptual problems when they attempted to identify and define 'Austrian nationality.'

Andrian-Werburg addressed these problematic issues in *Österreich und dessen Zukunft*. The book represents a good example of the political dilemmas the Austro-Germans experienced before the revolution of 1848. Several

themes are present in Andrian-Werburg's analysis: the repudiation of the assumption that 'Austria' and 'Austrian nationality' have any real meaning; 'Austrian patriotism', if it existed, was confined at best to regional allegiances; the policies of the Austrian government (although Metternich was not named, the criticism was directed at him) succeeded in compromising the idea of patriotism in Austria; the definition of patriotism as "a sense of community or public spirit" and the importance of individuals' involvement in the public life; Austria's loss of power in Germany and the ascendancy of Prussia; and the detrimental policy of the Holy Alliance towards the movements of national liberation in Europe. The text also documents the ambiguities of collective identification characterizing the Austrian '*Vormärz*.' On the one hand, it was influenced by a discourse of supra-ethnic patriotism, continuing the Enlightenment tradition (see **Joseph von Sonnenfels**, *On the love of Fatherland*); on the other hand, it defined the nation in a romantic key, on the basis of a common past, common language and organic ties.

With the outbreak of the Revolution in 1848 Andrian-Werburg was presented with the opportunity to test the ideas he developed in *Österreich und dessen Zukunft*. The first elected Imperial Diet moved from Vienna to Kroměříž (Cz. Kroměříž), where it compiled a draft constitution which replaced the crown-lands by '*Bundesländer*' (federated countries), one for each of the national groups in the monarchy. It seemed that the idea of subdividing the Austrian Empire into homogeneous districts according to nationalities had finally become possible. As a participant in these constitutional debates, Andrian-Werburg reiterated his ideas about the principle of autonomous self-administration of crown-lands and municipal communities he had refined in *Österreich und dessen Zukunft*. His suggestions were largely based on the system of the Austrian Estates, although Alexis de Tocqueville's influence, especially concerning the problem of administrative autonomy and municipal freedom, is also discernible. There should be a strong central government, Andrian-Werburg insisted; yet the crown-lands should be represented equally in the *Reichstag*. Furthermore, the crown-lands should be able to enjoy administrative and legislative powers that could contribute to their development. However, the new Emperor, Francis Joseph, did not accept this draft of the constitution, which was perceived, quite rightly, as an attempt to change the Habsburg Monarchy into a federation. Eventually, Francis Joseph's Prime Minister, Prince Felix Schwarzenberg (1800–1852), dissolved the Imperial Diet before it could enact the draft of the constitution.

Andrian-Werburg's main revolutionary episode occurred as vice president and chairman of the constitutional committee of the Frankfurt Parliament.

Two main issues characterized his activity in the Parliament, and both were discussed in *Österreich und dessen Zukunft*. The first referred to the public rights of national minorities; the second issue dealt with a constitutional arrangement between Austria and Prussia. First, Andrian-Werburg endorsed the rights of minority groups to use their own languages within the areas where they predominated, but he did not accept notions of linguistic equality. As an advocate of German cultural superiority, his interpretation of the nationality question reflected his endorsement of gradual and peaceful ‘Germanization’ of the Austrian Empire. Together with some of his close collaborators, such as Franz Schuselka (1811–1886), the spokesman of the liberals in the Frankfurt Parliament and the Kremsier Imperial Diet, and Ignaz Kuranda (1811–1886), the founder of a very influential newspaper in the 1840s, *Die Grenzboten*, Andrian-Werburg hoped that the national demands of Austria’s ethnic groups (especially the Czechs) would be addressed in a ‘Greater German state.’ Andrian-Werburg’s ideas were met with disapproval, notably among prominent Germans from Bohemia who supported the idea of a centralized German nation-state.

Andrian-Werburg’s view of Austria was ‘German’ (*deutschnational*), in the sense of incorporating ‘Austrian’ identity into a German nation. There was no need, as he explicitly put it in *Österreich und dessen Zukunft*, to create a separate ‘Austrian’ identity. ‘Austria’ was an “imaginary name” not because it did not exist; it was an “imaginary name” because there were no historical traditions and patriotic feelings to endorse its claim to existence. Andrian-Werburg’s promotion of ‘Greater Germany’ was thus a critique of the Austrian state’s failure to achieve a sense of national community amongst the peoples of Austria. The political dilemmas experienced by Andrian-Werburg before and during the Revolution of 1848 were not his alone, but became part of the debate over the future of Austria that came to preoccupy generations of political thinkers in Austria during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries.

MT

Austria and Her future

Austria is a purely imaginary name, denoting neither a distinct people, nor a country, nor a nation. It is a conventional appellation for a disparate group of quite distinct nationalities. Italians, Germans, Slavs and Hungarians together make up the Austrian Empire, but there is no such thing, nor has there ever been, as Austria, or the Austrians, or Austrian nationality, except in the

immediate area of Vienna. There is no sense of sympathy between them, nor any memory of centuries-old concord or greatness. No historical bonds (the history of Austria is short of facts) join its various peoples together into a single state, and none of them is sufficiently superior—in numbers, intelligence, influence or wealth—to be able to absorb the others.

An Austrian, therefore, has no sense of nationhood or national pride, no uplifting awareness of his own strength—of necessity, since he sees and feels himself as isolated, excluded from any community of intellect or sympathy with his fellow-citizens of different races, whom he will not and cannot accept as compatriots, and his narrow-minded patriotism embraces no more than his village, or at best his province.

This must be a very painful and oppressive feeling for an Austrian, and often have we pitied him on this account, as he stands alone among proud, confident peoples, the Cinderella of the great family of nations. A Frenchman, however mediocre and unprepossessing he may be, gains in stature every time he sings the praises of France, of his *grande nation*—and words lead to deeds, say what you will. Witness the Englishman in his proud isolation, who deems himself a king compared with men of other nations; witness how the lowliest citizen of Rome looked down on a king of the barbarians; or how the Russian, confident in his own strength and destiny, exalts himself above the rest and, like Brennus,¹ he tosses his sword into the scale. How small then must the Austrian feel, who knows no such sentiments, not a single one, and who can pride himself at most on attaining the office of chamberlain or privy councillor!

What has happened to patriotism is what always happens to the sacred when it is misused as a partisan weapon, and dragged down into the mire of everyday, ephemeral dispute. It has been pressed into service under all sorts of banners, invoked on the most contradictory of pretexts, and called upon to further all manner of different causes. Only once in our own times have our leaders and peoples joined in a unanimous, mighty appeal to patriotism, seeing therein their only hope of salvation; and on that one occasion it proved a wonderful and powerful talisman. Yet hardly was the goal achieved than this unanimity fell asunder, and what governments had so recently praised and admired they now eschewed, persecuted or, where this had no effect, de-

¹ Brennus, king of the Celts, who in 387 BC attached Rome, capturing all the city except for the Capitolium. The Romans had to pay a ransom and, according to the legend, during a dispute over the accuracy of the weights, Brennus threw his sword upon the scales with the exclamation, 'Vae Victis!' (woe to the defeated).

flected into byways and backwaters where it was sure to make no headway. Most recently, an attempt has been made to turn to advantage that which could not be altered by force, whereby national pride was perverted into national hate—as if a negation could exist without its positive premise.

What these attempts did prove—if any proof were necessary—was how much importance governments (as well as the governed) have always attached, quite rightly, to the existence of national sentiment or, as we should properly call it, a sense of community or public spirit. In times of normality, governments, misguided by wrong policies and narrow *petit bourgeois* exclusivity, have sought to hinder and weaken the citizen's involvement in public affairs, his awareness of the state and nation as complete entities, and the sense of solidarity that binds him to the whole and to his fellow-citizens. And in times of danger it was always governments who saw the need to fall back on that spurned and suppressed ally: patriotism. It is now time that this experience bore fruit; it is time that governments, having learned from history, finally understood that their most trustworthy ally is a strong and constantly active public spirit, engaging every citizen in the state and uniting the interests, opinions and efforts of each individual in a bond of common cause; and that the machinery of governments alone, without the active participation and absolute conviction of those individuals, can never achieve more than a negative, passive civic life held together by mere inertia, which of necessity will fall to pieces at the first slight shock. [...]

Thus, while every government has profited from a long peace and favorable circumstances, Austria, the Lord's unfaithful servant, has buried its talent in the hope of maintaining its status, while forgetting that he who stands still amid the general advance soon falls behind. Despite its leading position and glorious past, Austria has been superseded as the dominant force in Germany by Prussia, which has acquired, and is now using and expanding, its former influence. In Germany, Austria is unacknowledged, forgotten and resented as the bearer of outmoded and retrograde principles, while Prussia has shrewdly established itself at the forefront of progressive free-thinking. Now the Orient has risen up and a numerous and vigorous Christian population, under the protection of the great powers of Europe, has entered the great alliance of civilized nations and laid claim to a great and glorious future; and those peoples of like creed or race, who have till now been able to follow its example, are even now numbering the days of their hated oppressors, and turning their trusting gaze towards the same great powers who helped their brothers take their decisive step to liberty and civilization. But among those great powers, among the general cries for help throughout Europe, among the

anxious, frantic involvement of every Christian land in the struggle to liberate their Greek fellow-believers, one power has remained detached and isolated, watching the outcome of the conflict with sullen discontent. Against the tide of European sentiment it has not dared to side openly with the barbarian oppressors; yet its sympathies, wishes and secret endeavors have surely been in their favor. This power was Austria—a nation whose highest interests should have urged, in every respect, a close alliance with the Christian Orient. This incomprehensible policy has borne bitter fruit: Austrian influence in the region is in tatters, and anti-Austrian sentiment grows by the day—a hostility that is causing irreparable damage to Austrian commerce (which is almost entirely with those countries) and can be seen even in the most trivial of matters.

Translated by Robert Russell

FRANTIŠEK PALACKÝ: LETTER TO FRANKFURT, 11 APRIL 1848

Title: Letter to Frankfurt, 11 April 1848 (Psaní do Frankfurta dne 11. dubna 1848)

Originally published: *Národní noviny* (National Newspaper), Prague, Nos. 10 and 12, 1848

Language: Originally written in German, it was published in Czech in *Národní noviny*

The authorized Czech version was published in František Palacký, *Spisy drobné*, vol. I, edited by B. Rieger, (Prague: Bursík a Kohout, 1898), pp. 16–22.

About the author

See **František Palacký**, *A History of the Czech nation in Bohemia and Moravia*, pp. 50–51.

Context

In 1848 the Czech national movement finally went beyond being a prevalently cultural endeavor and entered the political arena. The main aims of the political agenda of the Czech liberals (František Palacký, František Ladislav Rieger, **Karel Havlí ek**, František Augustin Brauner) were to achieve the establishment of a constitutional system and to gain political autonomy for the Czechs in the Habsburg Empire. Palacký, a well-known scholar in the German-speaking world, was invited to take part in the ‘Board of Fifty’ in Frankfurt that was charged with the preparation of the German constituent assembly.

The main reason for this invitation was to win over the Czechs—as a tolerated minority inside the Austrian territory—for the building of a modern ‘Greater German’ nation-state. Especially Austrian liberals supporting the Greater German idea, such as **Viktor von Andrian-Werburg** and Franz

Sommaruga, did their best to help the Czechs get representation in the Frankfurt Parliament. They proposed a couple of resolutions about the linguistic and cultural needs of non-German minorities. They nevertheless had no doubts that the Czechs should be part of Germany and should help in the realization of the German national idea. The incorporation of the Bohemian Lands in the 'Greater German' polity had its historical logic, as the lands of the Bohemian Crown had been part of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation since the Middle Ages. There were, however, many practical arguments as well. In the years of its major political influence, from 1840 to 1870, and again around the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the supporters of the Greater German idea not only stressed the economic and cultural significance and superiority of the Germans in Bohemia, but employed a geopolitical argument as well. For them the territory of Bohemia and Moravia was a natural link between the northern and southern German lands.

For the Czech liberal nationalist movement formed in the *Vormärz* era, however, the Greater German program was unacceptable. Palacký refused the invitation to the Frankfurt assembly and instead formulated his own idea of the *raison d'être* of Austria and the aims of Czech national politics in the Central European context. His letter was a clear refutation of the idea of a Greater Germany from the Czech point of view, based on the proof of the sovereignty of the Bohemian Lands and above all on the liberal tenet of the equal 'natural rights' of all nations in Austria. He presented an alternative geopolitical perspective that contested the Greater German one, arguing that for the small nations, west of expansionist Imperial Russia, the only possibility of survival was in their political unity. The "vital artery of this necessary union of nations," a central axis, and hence the focus of the central governmental power, should have been the Danube. Vienna, therefore, was to maintain its leading role in an empire that, however, had to reformulate its national policy.

Palacký's 'Letter to Frankfurt' became the most important political statement of the Czech national movement in 1848, and a point of reference for the subsequent development of Czech national politics. His letter has been perceived as the first draft of the Czech concept of the federalization of the Austrian Empire, which became the basic tenet of Czech liberal politics. Palacký himself elaborated this idea during his work in the Imperial Diet in Vienna and Kremsier (Cz. Kroměříž) from June 1848 to March 1849. Especially in his last constitutional draft, presented in January 1849, he came very close to other liberal supporters of ethnic federalism in the Diet, such as the

Bohemian German Ludwig von Löhrer and the Slovene Matija Kavčič. The concept of federalization delineated the ideal relationship of the Czechs to the Austrian state. Once the Czech national idea finally prevailed in the 1830s and 1840s, Palacký—asserting the need of the Empire for ‘national existence’—made the conjunction of national consciousness and loyalty to Austria feasible. The concept of an Austrian federation became a necessary condition in mainstream Czech political thought until the Great War (see **František Palacký**, *Idea of the Austrian State*, and **Tomáš G. Masaryk**, *The New Europe*).

MK

Letter to Frankfurt, 11 April 1848

Gentlemen,

The post has just brought me the letter of 6 April in which you do me the honour of inviting me to Frankfurt to take part in the deliberations, the main purpose of which is to summon a German Parliament. It was a pleasant surprise to me to find in that letter full and authentic evidence of the confidence which the most distinguished men of the German Empire continue to have in my opinions; for in inviting me to a Diet of ‘German patriots’ they themselves acquit me of the unjust accusation so repeatedly brought against me of having shown myself an enemy of the German nation. It is with a sincere sense of gratitude that I acknowledge in that the noble kindness and justness of that excellent assembly; I consider myself therefore to be all the more obliged to answer it with full trust, directly and without reservation.

I am unable, gentlemen, to accept your invitation for my own person, nor can I send any other ‘trustworthy patriot’ in my stead. Permit me to give you, as briefly as possible, my reasons.

The object of your assembly is to establish a federation of the German nation in place of the existing federation of princes, to guide the German nation to real unity, to strengthen the sentiment of German national consciousness, and in this manner expand the power and strength of the German Empire. Although I respect such effort and the sentiments upon which it is based, I cannot, precisely for the reason that I respect it, participate in it in any manner whatsoever. I am not a German—at least I do not feel myself to be one—and you would assuredly not desire to call me in to join you as a mere assenter, a ‘yes-man’ without a mind or will of his own; for in that case I

should at Frankfurt either have to deny my true feelings and appear in false colors, or if it came to the point, raise my voice loudly in opposition. For the first I am too forthright and direct of speech, for the second I am not shameless and ruthless enough. I cannot therefore bring myself to break in with hostile notes upon a consensus and harmony which I regard as gratifying and desirous, not only in my own home but also in my neighbor's.

I am a Bohemian of Slavonic origin [*Ich bin ein Böhme slawischen Stammes*], and with all the little I possess and all the little I can do, I have devoted myself for all time to the service of my nation. That nation is a small one, it is true, but from time immemorial it has been a nation of itself and based upon its own strength. Its rulers were from olden times members of the federation of German princes, but the nation never regarded itself as pertaining to the German nation, nor throughout all the centuries was it regarded by others as so pertaining. The whole union of the Bohemian lands, first with the Holy Roman (German) Empire and then with the German confederation, was always a mere dynastic tie of which the Czech nation, the Czech Estates, scarcely desired to know anything and to which they paid no regard. This is an actual fact equally well known to all German historians and to myself; and if anyone is still prepared to doubt it, I offer to make the matter in due time perfectly clear and certain. Even if it were to be fully accepted as true that the Bohemian Crown had at one time been in feudal relationship with the German Empire (a contention which Czech publicists, however, have always denied), it cannot occur to any real historian to doubt, in so far as internal affairs are concerned, the one-time sovereignty and independence of the government and land of Bohemia. The whole world is well aware that the German Emperors had never, in virtue of their imperial dignity, the slightest to do with the Czech nation; that they possessed neither legislative, nor judicial, nor executive power either in Bohemia or over the Czechs; that they never had the right to raise troops or any royalties from that country; that Bohemia together with its crown lands was never considered as pertaining to any of the one-time ten German states; that appertenance to the Imperial Supreme Court of Justice never applied to it, and so on: that therefore the entire connection of the Bohemian lands with the German Empire was regarded, and must be regarded, not as a bond between nation and nation but as one between ruler and ruler. If, however, anyone asks that, over and above this heretofore existing bond between princes, the Czech nation should now unite with the German nation, this is at least a new demand—devoid of any historical and juridical basis, a demand to which I for my person do not feel justified in acceding until I receive an express and authentic mandate for so doing.

The second reason which prevents me from taking part in your deliberations is the fact that, according to all I have so far learned of your aims and intentions as publicly proclaimed, it is your irrevocable desire and purpose to undermine Austria as an independent empire and indeed to make her impossible for all time to come—an empire whose preservation, integrity and consolidation is, and must be, a great and important matter not only for my own nation but also for the whole of Europe, indeed, for humanity and civilization itself. Grant me there, too, a brief, favourable hearing.

You know, gentlemen, what Power it is that holds the entire East of our Continent. You know that this Power, now grown to vast dimensions, increases and expands of itself decade by decade in far greater measure than is possible for the countries of the West. You know that, secure at its own centre against practically every attack, it has become, and has for a long time been, a menace to its neighbors; and that, although it has unhindered access to the North, it is nevertheless, led by natural instinct, always seeking, and will continue to seek, to extend its borders southwards. You know, too, that every further step which it will take forward on this path threatens at an ever accelerated pace to give birth to, and to establish, a *universal monarchy*, that is to say, an infinite and inexpressible evil, a misfortune without measure or bound, such as I, though heart and soul a Slav, would nonetheless profoundly regret from the standpoint of humanity even though that monarchy be proclaimed as a Slavic one. Many persons in Russia name and regard me as an enemy of the Russians, doing me the same injustice as those in Germany who regard me as an enemy of the Germans. I am not, I would declare loudly and publicly, an enemy of the Russians: on the contrary, I observe with pleasure and sympathy every step forward which that great nation makes within its natural borders along the path of civilization; but with all my fervid love of my own nation I always pay greater respect to the good of humanity and learning than to the national good, and for this reason the bare possibility of a universal Russian monarchy has no more determined opponent or foe than myself—not because that monarchy would be Russian but because it would be universal.

You know that in the south-east of Europe, along the frontiers of the Russian empire, there live many nations widely differing in origin, in language, in history and morals—Slavs, Wallachians, Magyars, and Germans, not to speak of Turks and Albanians—none of whom is sufficiently powerful itself to bid successful defiance to the superior neighbor on the East for all time. They could only do so if a close and firm tie bound them all together as one. The vital artery of this necessary union of nations is the Danube. The focus

of power of such a union must never be diverted far from this river, if the union is to be effective and remain so. Assuredly, if the Austrian State had not existed for ages, it would have been in the interests of Europe and indeed of humanity to endeavor to create it as soon as possible.

Why is it, however, that we have seen this State, which by nature and history is predestined to be the bulwark and guardian of Europe against Asiatic elements of every possible type—why is it that we have seen it at a critical moment lacking help and almost devoid of counsel in the face of an advancing storm? It is because, in the unhappy blindness that has long afflicted her, Austria has long failed to recognize the real juridical and moral basis of her existence, and has denied it; the fundamental rule, that is, that all the nationalities and all the religions under her scepter should enjoy complete equality of rights and respect in common. The rights of nations are in truth the rights of Nature. No nation on earth has the right to demand that its neighbors should sacrifice themselves for its benefit, no nation is under an obligation to deny or sacrifice itself for the good of its neighbor. Nature knows neither dominant nor subservient nations. If the bond which unites a number of diverse nations in a single political entity is to be firm and enduring, no nation can have cause to fear that the union will cost it any of the things which it holds most dear. On the contrary, each must have the certain hope that in the central authority it will find defense and protection against possible violations by neighbors of the principles of equality. Then will every nation do its best to confer upon that central authority such powers as will enable it successfully to provide the aforesaid protection. I am convinced that even now it is not too late for this fundamental rule of justice, this *sacra ancora* for a vessel in danger of foundering, to be publicly and sincerely proclaimed in the Austrian Empire and energetically carried out in all its sectors by common consent. Every moment, however, is precious; for God's sake do not let us delay another hour with this! Metternich did not fall merely because he was the greatest foe of liberty but also because he was the bitterest, the most determined, enemy of all the Slavic races in Austria.

When I direct my gaze beyond the frontiers of Bohemia, natural and historical considerations constrain me to turn not to Frankfurt but to Vienna, to seek there the centre which is fitted and predestined to ensure and defend the peace, the liberty, and the rights of my nation. But *your* endeavors, gentlemen, seem now to me to be directed, as I have already said, not only towards ruinously undermining, but even utterly destroying, that center to whose authority and strength I look for salvation for the Bohemian lands and not alone for them. Or do you think that the Austrian State can continue to exist when

you forbid it in its hereditary domains to maintain an army of its own independent of Frankfurt as the joint head? Do you think that the Austrian Emperor or any sovereign who succeeds him will be able to maintain his position if you impose upon him the duty of accepting all the most important laws for your committee, and in this manner make the imperial Austrian Parliament and the provincial Diets of the united Kingdoms mere shadows without substance and power? And suppose that Hungary, following her own instincts, should sever her connection with the State, or what is much the same thing, should withdraw within herself—would such a Hungary as refuses to hear of racial equality within her borders be able to maintain herself free and strong in the future? Only the just is truly free and strong. A voluntary union of the Danubian Slavs and Wallachians, or even of the Poles themselves, with a State which declares a man must first be a Magyar before he can be a human being is wholly out of the question; and much more so is a compulsory union. If Europe is to be saved, Vienna must not sink to the role of a provincial town. If there exist in Vienna people who ask to have your Frankfurt as their capital, we can only cry: Lord, forgive them, for they know not what they ask!

Lastly, there is a third reason I must refuse to participate in your meeting—and that is that I consider all existing projects to give the German Empire a new system on the basis of the national will to be impossible and short lived in their performance, if you do not resolve to use real, life-and-death, medical methods. By that I mean the declaration of a Republic of Germany, even if it were only of a transitional form. All the prescriptions that have been attempted so far to divide power between the half-rule of the princes and the full-rule of the people, remind me of phalansterism,¹ which is also based on the fundamental rule that those whom it concerns will behave as numbers in calculations, and will not seek any validity other than what theory provides them. Perhaps my view is unjustified, perhaps I am wrong in my conviction—I honestly admit that I myself wish that it were so—but this is my genuine conviction, and I cannot relinquish this compass for even a moment if I do not want to drown in the tempest of the times without aid. As for the establishment of a republic in the German Reich, that is a matter entirely beyond the scope of my competence, and I have no wish therefore to express my opinion on it. From the borders of the Aus-

¹ Or phalansterianism: a system of phalansteries—communes—proposed by the French social reformer and mathematician Jean Baptiste Fourier (1768–1830) as a means to achieve universal harmony in society.

trian Empire, however, I must in advance reject, resolutely and emphatically, any thought of a republic. Imagine an Austrian Empire divided up into a number of republics, large and small—what a lovely basis for a universal Russian Monarchy!

In conclusion, to sum up these somewhat lengthy but only general remarks, I must briefly express my conviction that those who ask that Austria (and, with her, Bohemia) should unite on national lines with Germany are demanding that she should commit suicide—a step that has neither moral nor political sense. It would, on the contrary, be much more justifiable to demand that the German Empire be attached to the Austrian Empire, that is to say, that Germany should be incorporated into the Austrian State under the aforementioned conditions. As that, however, is not in accord with German national sentiment and German thinking, nothing remains but for the two Powers to organize themselves on an equality side by side, to turn their existing attachment into a eternal union for defense and resistance, and, if it is also to their mutual territorial benefit, to set up a customs union between themselves. I am glad to give a helping hand at any time to all means that are not a threat to the independence, integrity and development of the powers of the Austrian Empire, particularly to the east.

English translation first published as ‘Letter Sent By František Palacký to Frankfurt’, in *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 26. No. 67 (April 1948), pp. 303–308; reprinted in Charles and Barbara Jelavich (eds.), *The Habsburg Monarchy* (New York: Rinehart, 1959), pp. 18–23). Adapted and revised for the current volume by Derek Paton and Michal Kopeck.

MIKLÓS WESSELÉNYI: ORATION ON THE MATTER OF THE HUNGARIAN AND SLAVIC NATIONALITIES

Title: *Szózat a magyar és szláv nemzetiség ügyében* (Oration on the matter of the Hungarian and Slavic nationalities)

Originally published: Leipzig, Otto Wiegand, 1843

Language: Hungarian

The excerpts used are from the modern edition: Miklós Wesselényi, *Szózat a magyar és szláv nemzetiség ügyében* (Budapest: Európa, 1992), pp. 184–194.

About the author

Miklós Wesselényi [Zsibó (*Rom.* Jibou, present-day Romania), 1796 – Pest, 1850]: politician, political writer. He was the scion of a Transylvanian oppositional aristocratic family, his father having achieved fame for his cultural patriotism and for his spectacular clashes with the central administration, which resulted in his imprisonment by Joseph II. The young Miklós was educated by private tutors, and was also influenced by Ferenc Kazinczy, who was a friend of his family. Already in his youth Wesselényi attracted wider attention with his intellectual capacities. In the 1810–1820s, he made a number of trips—on one occasion with **István Széchenyi**—to Italy, France, and England and became conscious of the socio-economic gap between Hungary and Western Europe. In the 1830s he emerged as one of the protagonists of the opposition movement, being active in the Transylvanian and Hungarian Diets as well. At the beginning, he was the closest ally of Széchenyi, but gradually he became more radical. The Viennese government disapproved of Wesselényi's public activities, and he was indicted on charges of disloyalty to the Crown. In the spring of 1838 he was in Pest when the Danube flooded the city and through his heroic rescue efforts he saved hundreds of people, which earned him great repute. In 1839, after litigation lasting for four years, he was sentenced to three years imprisonment. He never served his term, as due to an illness he lost his sight in one eye and was released for treatment in a Silesian sanatorium (Gräfenberg; present-day Lázně Jeseník, Czech Republic). In 1844 he became totally blind and withdrew from public life. Nevertheless, he continued to publish political articles. In 1848, already seriously ill, he participated in the Transylvanian Diet when it declared union with Hungary. Soon after this, however, he came to consider the revolution as doomed to fail and left the country for Gräfenberg. He died in April 1850 on his way back to Hungary. He is considered as one of the iconic figures of the Hungarian Reform Age.

Main works: *A régi híres ménesek egyike megszűnésének okairól* [On the causes of the dissolution of one of the old and famous studs] (1829); *Balítéletekről* [On misjudgments] (1833); *Szózat a magyar és szláv nemzetiség ügyében* [Oration on the matter of the Hungarian and Slavic nationalities] (1843); *Teendők a lótenyésztés körül* [Tasks regarding horse-breeding] (1847).

Context

The intellectual itinerary of Wesselényi is in many ways representative of the evolution of the Hungarian ‘liberal nationalism’ of the Reform Age. In the 1820s he subscribed to the vision of **István Széchenyi**, which sought to promote the social life of the nobility—with casinos, horse-races and cultural foundations—and also hoped to modernize the economical structure of the country by adopting new technologies and developing the infrastructure. In his political activities of the early 1830s, however, Wesselényi went beyond this program towards a more encompassing insitutional reform, and his stance towards Vienna became increasingly conflictual. Building on traditional oppositional rhetoric, he emphasized the constitutional harm caused by the government and tried to mobilize the institutional framework of the estates in order to implement a wide range of social and political reforms. He thus established a conceptual link between the ‘liberties’ of Hungarian ‘ancient constitutionalism’ and modern ‘civic liberty.’

This agenda of reform thus embraced not only the securing of more freedom, e.g., freedom of the press, for the traditional ‘political nation’, but extending the framework of the nation to the underprivileged strata by emancipating the serfs. While Wesselényi was a fervent supporter of these reforms, he admitted that such a profound transformation had its dangers as well, as the entrance of the previously underprivileged and overwhelmingly non-Hungarian masses, who nursed an ardent hatred against their erstwhile oppressors, could have catastrophic consequences for the entire Hungarian nation. Looking at the example of the Western nation-states, Wesselényi came to the conclusion that the old ties of hierarchy that had bound the society of the *ancien régime* together needed to be supplemented by a new national solidarity.

Therefore, in contrast to Széchenyi’s more reserved position, Wesselényi suggested that the extension of rights should entail the ‘extension of nationality’ even to the ethnically non-Hungarian inhabitants of the country, who made up around 55 percent of the population. In his understanding, the Hungarian reform movement, facing the double challenge of Austrian autocracy

and the alternative national projects of the Slavic peoples, could only be successful if it managed to develop a general feeling of national allegiance among the population. Hence, one of the crucial theoretical and practical problems was to find a solution for the potential contradiction between the process of Hungarian nation-building and the exigencies of co-existence in a region characterized by ethnic plurality. He was convinced that this problem could be solved only in a broader international context.

The fate of the Polish uprising of 1830–1831 was a formative experience for Wesselényi's generation. The crushing of the uprising by the Tsarist troops convinced many liberal politicians that the freedom of Europe's small nations was threatened particularly by Russia. At the same time, Wesselényi hoped that the 'spirit of the age' would eventually introduce constitutionalism into the Habsburg Empire. If Austria could be turned into a model-state for liberalism, it could promote the reconstruction of the whole of Europe along such lines, by catalyzing a constitutionalist movement in Prussia, creating a Greek and a South-Slavic state in the Balkans, and reconstituting Poland. The thrust of his argument, which had originally been directed to the Hungarian situation, thus led to a pan-European vision of liberal nationalism, in which the national units were moulded into federal states. In this vision the Hungarian constitutional tradition, jealously preserved by the 'political nation,' could be re-evaluated as a potential catalyst, not only for Hungarian modernization, but also for a liberal transformation of the entire Habsburg Empire.

In regard to the Habsburg lands, Wesselényi proposed a federalist solution, based on the autonomy of the historical provinces (in Wesselényi's proposal these federal entities should be the German, Italian and Hungarian territories of the Empire, plus the envisioned Bohemian, Galician and Illyrian autonomies). As for Hungary proper, Wesselényi secured for the Croats a completely different status than for all other nationalities of the Crown of Saint Stephen—accepting their claims to distinct nationhood on historical/legal grounds. The other nationalities, however, were expected to subordinate themselves to the Hungarian 'political nation.' In his opinion, the state as such could not be culturally neutral (since nationality and the constitution are only two sides of the same coin). At the same time, he emphasized that national development was ultimately subordinated to the formation of civil society.

It is indicative of his position that in his political writings of the 1830–1840s, rather than describing his native Transylvania as a separate entity in a potential federal framework, he was a fervent supporter of its union with Hungary. In this he was influenced mainly by the consideration that the in-

centives for modernization, especially concerning the situation of the serfs, were coming from the Hungarian parliament, while the Transylvanian institutional system was much more archaic and immobile. Thus, it was the interest of the overwhelming majority of the population, regardless of nationality, to join Hungary and thus enjoy the fruits of the liberal reforms.

In sum, the 'Oration' is a paradigmatic text from the Hungarian liberal nationalist camp on the nationality question. Wesselényi's concept contains the key elements of this discursive tradition, and thereby also exposes its theoretical contradictions, which came to the fore during the Revolution of 1848, as well as its ambivalent stance towards the nationalities. While he was willing to give extensive civil rights to all citizens of Hungary regardless of their ethnic background, he considered institutional self-organization by the nationalities as potentially harmful to the 'common good' of the country. Most importantly, Wesselényi thought of the Slavic 'awakening' in the territory of Hungary in terms of a Pan-Slav agitation instigated from outside, which thus turned the otherwise justifiable demands for civic liberty in a retrograde direction. He considered it an 'unnatural' alliance of plebeian and aristocratic agitators, seemingly united only for the sake of the cultivation of national literature, but, in the long run, serving the interests of the tyrannical Russian Empire. It was along these lines that, after the traumas of 1849, Hungarian nationalism again took up some of his arguments, though increasingly separating them from their original liberal connotations.

BT

Oration on the matter of the Hungarian and Slavic nationalities

[...]

Austria is not a purely unrestricted power and she cannot be such. As a Hungarian sovereign she is restricted, and only as such can she be sovereign in Hungary. This restrictedness and her unlimited power in other countries is a constant object of derision and a mutual affront for both parties. At one place she must profess and follow principles that she refutes and shuns elsewhere. She cannot parade in such a simultaneously limited and unlimited double role. But were she a completely unrestricted power, she still would not be able to play a leading role as such. The queen, the leader and the chief representative of autocracy is Russia. Every other power hoisting the banner of autocracy must perforce be under her leadership and superiority. Austria, as a power not everywhere and thus not entirely unrestricted, can only be in a

subordinate position in this respect; and even in such a position, we have seen from how many sides and by how many factors her survival is endangered and challenged. However, if she adopts the watch-word of constitutionalism, and if she thus becomes a leader of civilization and lawful and peaceful progress, she will certainly become the first power in Europe. She will gain such a primacy, almost lifting her above having to fear any other power, that she will offend or oppress no one, and she will not disturb or threaten either materially or spiritually the European balance either by her commerce, her military power or her policies. [...]

Austria and Prussia should hoist the standard of constitutionalism together. Every prince and every nation of Germany, nay, every constitutional country would then join this alliance and become united in it. This would become a real Holy Alliance.

If, as an already constitutional power in Hungary, Austria wishes to cherish and enhance the reputation of the constitution of this country with honorable intention and a firm will; if she lends a helping hand in repairing its deficiencies, in supplementing and correcting its faultier or weaker pages in accordance with propriety and the requirements of the age, employing all her lawful power for this end: then this country would with an incredible speed become a power capable of elevating the strength and glory of her beloved sovereign and of increasing the weight of her power in the European balance—capable by herself, but even more so with the other countries of the state endowed with a similar constitution.

Furthermore, the other provinces of Austria should also be given a constitution.

By granting a constitution and a representative system to Lombardy, this country and this nation would be bound to us by the links of zeal and loyalty defying every vicissitude. Its strength would become formidable, and it would be completely and enduringly secured from any fancy of independence and revolutionary temptations.

The German provinces of Austria, Styria and Tyrol should form a constitutional body together. Silesia, even though separated from them geographically, as a predominantly German province should nevertheless belong to them. In Carinthia and Carniola the German element is perhaps developed and widespread enough for these provinces to join the former. In any case, due consideration should be shown towards the Slavic nationalities living there. Their position could be similar to that of the Croats in Hungary or the Saxons in Transylvania.

Bohemia and Moravia should form a separate constitutional Slavic country.

Likewise, Galicia should possess a constitution of its own and exist as a purely Polish province.

The part of Istria inhabited by Italians could be united with Lombardy, and its Slavic part with Dalmatia.

Dalmatia as a land owned on the basis of the inherited right of the Hungarian Crown and as a complementary part of the Hungarian Crown should be annexed to Croatia and Slavonia. In the latter provinces, besides granting the intactness of the Slavic nationalities and with a full flourishing in their civic interior affairs, the favors of the Hungarian constitution could be extended, the pre-condition of possessing these favors being their close and irresolvable connection with Hungary.

The excuse and counter-argument that this or that people are not yet mature enough to have a constitution, and that granting and establishing a constitution is a precarious and dangerous endeavor, has become outmoded and hackneyed. It is indeed useful and even necessary that a constitution should be based on historical antecedents and fundaments, and it should indeed be rooted in the character and inner life of a nation; but the fact that it is possible to grant a constitution to nations that are not by any means among the most developed ones, and that it is possible to set it in place without any danger or unrest is amply illustrated by the example of Wallachia and Moldavia, where a constitution was simultaneously granted and established without any disturbance.

With constant regard for mutual tolerance and consideration it would surely not be an impossible task to set up commercial relations between the aforementioned countries in the context of their adoption of a constitution. This would seem all the more feasible because in an alliance of states the members, being connected by constitutional ties and therefore by common interests and practical circumstances, would in all probability be ready to make mutual sacrifices both in order to show a regard for the interests of the other members and to promote the good of the common whole. [...]

If Austria were such a constitutional power, made up of countries and nations founded upon their own nationalities but materially and spiritually united by related interests and by a devotion to their common sovereign, then the many foreign elements within Austria, which now confront each other as well as her with hostility, some indeed even menacing her, would become her steadfast allies and factors of her strength. The Russian influence upon the Slavic population would cease, as they would no longer have anything to hope from it, and in their constitutional position they would gain benefits such as they could not expect from that unrestricted power. The venom of

revolutionary aspirations would also be ineffective, because the nations would already possess things—and possess them through peaceful means, blessing their benign prince for it—for which they might otherwise have resorted to destructive revolutionary attempts to obtain: namely, a life under a constitution but founded upon their nationality.

If Austria as a giant of constitutionality, together with a similarly constitutional Prussia, were to come forward as the head and leader of constitutionality and civilization, and gather under this glorious banner all the countries and nations of Germany, which would regard them as protectors of their nationality and constitutional life; if the whole of civilized Europe were to see in these two powers the mighty patrons of lawfulness, national independence, enlightenment and free trade; see them as powers just as ready and able to fight with vigor and resolution against a crude and unrestricted autocracy as against licence and thousand-headed revolutionary tyranny—why the world then wouldn't witness the emergence of a protective power uniting nations and sovereigns that would permanently ensure the future of Europe amidst any future turn of events and circumstances? [...]

If the constitutional holy alliance founded in the aforementioned manner were to be in existence when the last hour of the age-worn Turkish domination in their European realms was at hand—by whatever cause this should come about—Europe could be certain that the disintegrating empire, or most of it, would neither be engulfed by Russia, which would thus come to preponderate over the other powers, nor would the flame of civil wars provoked by a revolutionary spirit flare up in various parts of the empire and brute force and disorder prevail.

Through the intercession of this alliance and under its shelter and security, separate and independent countries would hopefully emerge from the collapsing empire, countries with constitutions rooted in their nationality, like so many new conquests of civilization, so many new and exuberant fields for the improving intellect and the development of spiritual and material prosperity.

The image of a solemnly impressive and majestic future would appear. The one-time Byzantium would emerge as the capital of a Christian dynasty and nation, but not of a nation pampered and corrupted by vices as she used to be, but of a country with a vision of the great aims of the development of civility and constitutionality, young, guided by sobriety and rising in strength; the seat of a king elected from the dynasties of Germany in whom the crafts, the sciences and trade would find a zealous patron.

Enlarged with the neighboring territories inhabited by Greeks which have till now remained outside the bastion of her constitutional life, present-day

Greece would become, as a worthy successor of her ancient glory and culture, a deserving and useful member in the glorious family of Europe's constitutional powers through the effect of her ever improving and developing constitution under her present reigning House.

The Slavic territories under Turkish rule, such as Bosnia and Bulgaria, would form, together with Serbia, a Slavic or Illyrian kingdom endowed with a constitution adapted to their nationality and level of culture; the throne of this kingdom would be occupied by a member of the Austrian reigning family.

Wallachia and Moldavia together are by no means too small to make up a kingdom, either with regard to their territory (2,000 square miles)¹ or their population (3,200,000). Their position is so advantageous, and nature has endowed them with so many riches that their intellectually developing nation could secure for them a not insignificant place of general benefit in the civilized world. These two principalities are already constitutional. And to unite these two related constitutions and to correct their poorer or defective aspects would surely be a much easier task than it proved to be to provide newly fashioned constitutions all at once for those territories under and accustomed to the Turkish yoke, as in fact happened in 1831 without any detrimental consequences. [...]

The elevation of Poland to national and constitutional independence would be not only an indispensable precondition for Europe to reach such a degree of constitutionality and the lawful triumph of its nationalities, but also an irrevocable tribute to eternal justice. [...]

The views and wishes elaborated so far by no means set out or presume the downfall or even a real diminution of Russia. Her area is so vast, her resources are so stupendous, she can and must do so much internally that centuries of activity requiring vigorous and concentrated labor lie ahead of her if she wishes to elevate her population, culture and trade to the rank that they are capable of attaining. That this is indeed her laudable goal, and that she truly has no wish to subjugate Europe and exert an oppressive supremacy over it or disturb its strength and peace, all this she will have ample opportunities to prove during the changes presumably soon to be expected in the East. That her activities related to the East have not been motivated by plans to obtain booty and extend her power she will be able to demonstrate by not opposing the formation of constitutional countries to be established on the basis of the nationalities living there. For, since the establishment of such

¹ Wesselényi calculated in 'German land miles,' which equals ca. 7500 meters.

countries would promote civilization and thus active transport and trade between the nations and the ensuing progress of industry and science, and have a beneficial influence over the whole of mankind, bringing intellectual as well as material profit to it, Russia will, by espousing their formation, show that she too has this common profit and prosperity at heart. And as these countries would safeguard Europe's stability against her threatening predomination, such support provided for them will demonstrate that she does not wish to upset this stability, and that she values the tranquillity and strength of Europe to such a degree that she agrees to offer such a further reassuring guarantee against her preponderance beyond that represented by the inconstant factor of the personality and moderation of the sovereigns sitting upon her throne.

And that her policy is informed by such an appreciation and by sound principles with regard to Europe's peace and strength, this she can prove above all by showing a readiness to effect the construction of a bastion without which Europe may forever feel threatened by Russian power or the conquering spirit of any of her rulers. This bastion is without doubt Poland.

If she approves of the transformation of this nation into an independent constitutional country under its own king, not a Russian but from some other, for instance, Prussian dynasty, then—and only then—shall everything said about the Russian claims to supremacy and even to universal monarchy become simply a slander.

Translated by Dávid Oláh

JANKO DRAŠKOVIĆ: DISSERTATION, OR TREATISE

Title: *Disertacija iliti razgovor, darovan gospodi poklisarom zakonskim i budućim zakonotvorcem kraljevinah naših za buduću dietu ungarsku odaslanem, držan po jednom starom domorodcu kraljevinah ovih* (Dissertation, or Treatise, given to the honourable lawful deputies and future legislators of our Kingdoms, delegated to the future Hungarian Diet; by an old patriot of these Kingdoms)

Originally published: Karlovac, Joan Nepomuk Prettner, 1832

Language: Croatian

The excerpts are translated from the German edition: Janko Drašković, *Erinnerungen an die zum ungarischen Reichstag bestimmten Deputirten der Königreiche Kroatien und Slavonien. Ein Beitrag zur Würdigung des politischen Lebens im ungarischen Staatenvereine, von einem Alt-Kroaten. Aus dem Illyrischen übersetzt* (Leipzig: A. B. Liebeskind, 1834), pp. xiii–xiv, 13–18, 39–40, 43, 54–55.

About the author

Janko Drašković [1770 (Zagreb) – 1856 (Radgona, *Ger.* Radkersburg, today Gornja Radgona, Slovenia)]: writer and politician. A descendant of a Croatian aristocratic family with a military tradition, Drašković received a private education in his home town and in Vienna, where he was taught law and philosophy. From 1787 to 1792, he served in the Austrian army and participated in the Austro-Turkish War (1788–1790). After retirement from the military, Drašković started to participate in the sessions of the Croatian Sabor. He visited France in 1808, which would later be misleadingly interpreted as a source of his political opinions. After the Peace of Schönbrunn, Drašković's estates were allotted to the Illyrian Provinces (1809–1813); yet he declined an offer of French citizenship and preserved political loyalty to the Habsburgs. After the restoration of constitutional life in the Kingdom of Hungary in 1825 he continued his public engagement, which culminated, in 1832, in the first political treatise written in the Croatian neo-*štokavian* language. At the time, the Croatian nobility was preoccupied with the struggle for the retention of their municipal rights against the Magyars, who at the Diet of 1830 requested the introduction of the Hungarian language into public life throughout the Kingdom of Hungary. From 1832 to 1836 Drašković was a Croatian delegate at the Diet in Pressburg (*Hun.* Pozsony, today Bratislava), where he was assisted by a group of young law students

who would constitute the core of the Illyrian Movement. Relying upon his aristocratic authority, Drašković set out to found different institutions of sociability which would contribute to the spreading of Illyrianism. In 1838 he established the Illyrian Reading Club in Zagreb, to coordinate all aspects of cultural production in the 'Illyrian language.' At the same time, he allocated a special role to upper-class women in the developing of national sentiment among the youth. On the subject of their educational duties Drašković addressed a brochure 'A word to the noble-minded daughters of Illyria', and a Society of Female Patriots was established at his initiative. In 1840 he was especially engaged with founding the National Theater, and assisted in the establishment of the 'Illyrian Foundation' (*Matica ilirska*) for publishing the older Croatian literature in the *štokavian* dialect. In 1841 he presided over the newly established Illyrian Party (from 1843 the National Party), and in 1848 participated in the sessions of the Croatian Sabor, where he advocated the establishment of an independent Croatian government, which would, however retain a common legislature with the Magyars. He withdrew from political life in 1849, disillusioned with the victory of reaction. In 1893 his bones were transferred from Austria to Croatia. Due to the programmatic form of his *Dissertation* written in the Croatian language, Count Janko Drašković has been traditionally regarded as the chief political ideologist and the 'Father' of the Croatian National Revival.

Main works: *Disertacija iliti razgovor, darovan gospodi poklisarom zakonskim i budućim zakonotvorcem kraljevinah naših za buduću dietu ungarsku odaslanem, držan po jednom starom domorodcu kraljevinah ovih* [Dissertation, or Treatise, given to the honorable lawful deputies and future legislators of our Kingdoms, delegated to the future Hungarian Diet; by an old patriot of these Kingdoms] (1832); *Mladeži ilirskoj* [To the Illyrian youth] (1836); *Ein Wort an Illyriens hochherzige Töchter über die ältere Geschichte und neueste literarische Regeneration ihres Vaterlandes* [A word to the noble-minded daughters of Illyria on the older history and on the most recent literary regeneration of their homeland] (1838); *Starší dějepís a nejnovejší literární obnova národu ilirského* [The older history and the latest literary regeneration of the Illyrian nation] (Czech translation, 1845).

Context

In 1784 Joseph II introduced German as the official language for the territory of the whole multi-national Habsburg Monarchy. The decision caused an enormous backlash, especially in the Kingdom of Hungary, where Latin was regarded as the constitutional language and the chief medium of public discourse throughout the realm. The argumentation of enlightened absolutism designated the use of Latin as the sign of 'backwardness,' due to its social exclusivity and incapacity to implement popular enlightenment, or *Volksaufklärung*, which required a living and polished vernacular. Hungarian patriots assumed that the language revival could be used as a means against the Josephist violation of Hungarian rights and privileges. Such an agenda, which culminated during the joint Diet in 1790 at Pressburg with the request

that Hungarian be introduced as the official language into the Kingdom of Hungary, caused a strong reaction on the part of the Croatian estates, the only constitutional partners of the Hungarian nobility. At that time, patriotism was manifested in the public use of the vernaculars, or *linguae patriae*. Such circumstances, which revealed differences in the cultural value of national languages, caused the Diet for the first time to thematize Croatian municipal rights, which, along with the retention of Latin as the official language, identified 'Croatianness' with Catholicism and anti-Protestantism. These rights also accentuated the contractual position of the *Croatae*, the noble *natio politica* of the Kingdoms of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia, which was believed to have voluntarily accepted St. Stephen's Crown in 1102, reinforced by the *Pacta conventa*. These rights, among which the issue of language was the most substantial, were constantly the objects of debate at the joint diets until 1832, when Drašković used for the first time the standardized Croatian language instead of Latin or German as a medium of political discourse. Tension over the introduction of the Hungarian language started in 1791, when a course on Magyar language and literature was introduced as an optional subject at the Academy of Sciences in Zagreb, whereupon the Croatian Sabor asked for a reciprocal introduction of an Illyrian course in Hungary. Supporters of teaching the Hungarian language interpreted this act as an indicator of the tightening up of the *nexus intimus* with Hungary as the *regnum socium*, which aimed at understanding the debates related to issues of common importance and the possibility of finding employment more easily in the common institutions. The culmination of the debate was achieved in 1827, when, at the request of the joint Diet, Magyar came to be introduced as an obligatory subject in all Croatian higher academic institutions.

The year 1790 saw for the first time a drift in the use of the supranational and civic concept of *Hungarus*¹ designating the noble *natio politica* consisting of Magyars and Croats. The focus of political loyalty began to be directed more to the *linguae patriae* than to the *patria* itself, understood primarily as the territorial designation of the Kingdom of Hungary. The language issue contributed to the tension between Croats and Magyars. Some parties qualified the retention of Latin as 'backward' and contrary to the pro-

¹ In the early modern period the concept of "Hungarus" referred to members of the Hungarian political nation (*natio hungarica*) regardless of ethnic provenience. Around 1800, it was used, both by the non-Magyar elites of the Kingdom of Hungary and by some of the socio-economic reformers, as a conceptual alternative to the emerging cultural understanding of 'Hungarianess' (*Magyarság*).

gress of civilization, but the main point of disagreement was the cultural status of the Hungarian language, which for non-speakers had no civilizational value. Such debates catalyzed the arguments for the amplitude and antiquity of the 'Illyrian language', spoken by most Croats, and for whom the introduction of any foreign living language was a mark of 'slavery.' Still, up to 1820, the *Hungari*-option prevailed both among the Croats and Magyars along with the retention of Latin as the constitutional language, which resulted in the participation of the Croatian nobility in financing various cultural institutions of common interest, such as the Hungarian National Museum and the 'Ludoviceum' Military Academy. The party of *Hungari* advocated social and economic reforms, and tolerance towards the non-Hungarian languages and cultures in the Kingdom. From 1820 onwards, the distinction between the concepts of 'patriotism' and 'nationalism' grew deeper, the former emphasizing symbolic loyalty towards the 'state' and the latter towards the 'nation', which, if understood in linguistic terms, could not equate Magyars and Croats. The Magyars could construct their collective identity on the basis of the equation of 'nationhood' and 'statehood'. In contrast, by accepting 'Illyrian' as a genetic term within the broader concept of 'Slavic reciprocity', the Croatian Romantics separated the vision of 'nation' from the vision of 'state'—crossing the boundaries of the Triune Kingdom and postulating a new, broader South Slavic national community. The year 1830 with the final standardization of the Croatian neo-*štokavian* orthography saw thus the beginning of the symbolic 'Illyrian Awakening' and 'Regeneration,' which in 1832 was followed by the introduction of the teaching of Croatian language and literature at the Academy in Zagreb.

In his 'Dissertation' Count Drašković addresses the future delegates at the joint Diet at Pressburg, presenting the Croatian *štokavian* dialect as worthy of being a national language with a continuity of literature ever since Humanism. His discourse on nation shows a liberal and Romantic rupture from the traditional concept of the socially exclusive *natio politica*, so the delegates were asked to be representatives of the whole nation "regardless of faith and birth". Loyalty to the Croatian-Slavic nation is justified from the Herderian point of view, because its chief national characteristics are 'virtue,' 'fidelity,' 'courage' and 'obstinacy,' and especially the Romantic notion of the 'great heart' (*Cro. veliko srce*). On the other hand, political loyalty should be directed to the 'king' and to the 'homeland' (*Cro. domovina*), which was more and more limited to the Croatian Kingdoms exclusively. The usage of the language of natural law further justifies patriotism, which is necessary from the point of view of natural morality, as

is the use of the vernacular in public affairs. However, the Croats are perceived as a “nation without a mother tongue”, and the delegates’ duty should be to refute that prejudice.

Such argumentation needs historical evidence especially with relation to the Magyars, so Drašković reiterates how the Croats voluntarily made a deal with the Hungarian kings, with whom they agreed to form a “federative society.” Although Magyars also neglected their language and laws under the reign of the Austrian rulers, they were re-awakened after Joseph II’s death, and in Drašković’s view, they aimed at merging the two Kingdoms, Croatia and Hungary, into one. The wish of the Magyars to impose their vernacular on non-Magyars is refuted by invoking the natural right of nations to cultivate their own language—“the spiritual connection between peoples and countries.” Furthermore, Drašković lists a set of grievances, which, next to the usual municipal rights-discourse, introduces the new political concept of the ‘Kingdom of Illyria,’ grounded in historical and natural rights and based on a common language.

This construct, which would incorporate Dalmatia, Bosnia, and even the Slovenian provinces, is named ‘Great Illyria’ (*Cro. Velika Ilirija*)—in contrast to the former ‘Kingdom of Illyria,’ which was created by Francis I (II) in 1816 (and abolished in 1822) and which consisted only of the remnants of the French ‘Illyrian Provinces.’ Nevertheless, Drašković advocates a common market with the Kingdom of Hungary, as well as the establishment of a Hungarian State Bank and money exchange courts, which would support different commercial and industrial projects. In this proposal Drašković seems to follow the lead of the Hungarian reformer Count **István Széchenyi** and the model of utilitarian English liberalism. Furthermore, he sees education and a liberal attitude of the nobility toward their subjects as the only means of progress in order to catch up with Western Europe. In fact, it can be seen that both Drašković and Széchenyi use in their arguments a paternalistic aristocratic rhetoric. It assigned a special social role in the moral regeneration of nation to the aristocracy, whose duty it was to spread the spirit of noble enlightenment. However, both Drašković and Széchenyi support the idea of “developing and ennobling nationality” which among other things implied cultivation of the mother tongue, refinement of manners and self-education. Finally, it is obvious that Drašković clearly develops the ‘East-West’ discourse and the middle position of the Croatian Kingdoms between the two cultural regions, which would become a constant point of reference in the future.

The ‘Dissertation’ established itself among the public from the very beginning as the most complete and the most basic program of the whole Ro-

mantic movement of 'national awakening,' and as such it became incorporated into the national canon as early as the nineteenth century. Its 'anti-Magyar discourse' fitted the political atmosphere ensuing the Croatian-Hungarian Compromise (1868), when the myth of the Croatian capitulation before the Magyars in the 1820s was launched. In the 1930s its canonical status was corroborated by the Yugoslav memory of the Illyrian Movement. In the 1990s it was again re-read as a program advocating Croatian historical and state rights as well as the right to national self-determination, which could justify the separation of the Republic of Croatia from Yugoslavia.

TSB

**Dissertation, or Treatise, given to the honorable lawful deputies
and future legislators of our Kingdoms,
delegated to the future Hungarian Diet;
by an old patriot of these Kingdoms**

In my treatise I shall use our own mother tongue, in the hope of demonstrating its ability to express all that the heart and reason may demand. I have chosen the most complete of our dialects, that preferred by our old men of letters. As the table in the appendix shows, it is the one most widely used among the Slavic-Croats who form the root stock of our kingdoms. It is surely also the only dialect shared by Slavonians, the Military Border-, littoral, and the River Kupa-dwellers, Dalmatians, Bosnians, Montenegrins and those Croats known as 'Water (Bosnian)-Croats', who are dispersed throughout Hungary. All the old books printed in Zagreb, Požega, Split, Venice, Wittenberg² and Dubrovnik, the Missals of Senj and the littoral bishoprics are predominantly written in this dialect. No one, even after living for years in another region, would ever exchange it for another; yet, having learned it, no one would continue to speak his own mixed dialect.

[...] For these reasons, therefore, be confident that Dalmatia will once more be reunited with us, and that we shall again form one nation and one blood, numbering over two million people. And possibly even more: for in time Bosnia, where so many of our families dwelt, may once again, with our help, return to our bosom. What a splendid prospect for our nation! More-

² Here Drašković most probably refers to the publishing activities of the sixteenth-century Croatian Protestants. However, it was not Wittenberg, but rather Urach-Tübingen, where the Croatian printing press was situated.

over, since it is the permissible hope of every heart and request of every tongue, even that part now called Illyria, which speaks a dialect related to our own, could, through the great goodness of our Kings, be united with us. Undoubtedly, such an Illyrian kingdom, numbering some four and a half million souls, would bring honor to our name, strength to our constitution, advantage to the crown for centuries to come, and tip the balance in our favor.

[...] To return to the differences we have with Hungary, we willingly acknowledge that each nation has the desire and the right to speak its own language, to write it, and to publish in it, so that every native can understand it in public affairs and every literary subject can be treated in it. A nation that cannot do that has no moral fatherland; for language is the spiritual connection between peoples and countries. The inhabitants of a state can only be accorded a place in human society according to the degree of moral education, as contained in their speeches, books and deeds. It was therefore time for the Hungarians to fulfil this duty laudably for themselves.

From this it does not follow, however, that they may impose their own Hungarian tongue on another, federate nation which speaks its own ancient language if the contract of federation does not permit it. We have shortly before demonstrated that the fusion of our own ancient and rich language with Hungarian is now no longer practicable as once. For that would mean to want to recommence and to complete immediately, what their more sagacious and powerful forebears once strove humanely to accomplish only after making a long effort. Now not only you, but any reasonable Hungarian, will concede that this is not the time to subject a nation of more than a million-and-a-half stalwart souls to such a humiliation.

[...] It also behoves us to follow the good example of the Hungarians, and acknowledge the value, in our judgement, of the good and reasonable course they have chosen. Let us therefore show that we too have a language of our own fit for, and worthy of, any culture; let us take it as our language of public affairs and strive to adapt it to every general and scientific need, as the Hungarians have recently done. Believe me, therein lies our best answer to their usurpatory desire to introduce their language among our people.

[...] The chief and most urgent need is to establish and consolidate money exchange courts, so that by passing quick sentences on letters of credit everybody is granted and given that to which his debtor has bound himself. This would immediately increase confidence; merchants and all those requiring capital for useful business undertakings would then be able to find money throughout Europe, whereas at present, in the absence of such courts, foreign as well as local investors are often loath to lend money to a Hungarian or a

Croat, preferring, to the great detriment of the fatherland, to take their capital out of circulation by placing it in the abhorred lotteries and letters of credit of overseas trade, rather than face the trouble and expense of having to recover what belongs to them through lawsuits. Such lotteries are of benefit only to speculators, bringing cash only into the purses of those who, to our own disadvantage even in our lifetime, may continue to invest in other powers. Out of this lack of confidence, therefore, may arise not only a lack of necessary monies, but also political disadvantages.

[...] We lie in the middle of Europe, beckoned by both East and West; the former a twilight zone, the latter a realm of over-enlightenment; the former in a condition of subjugation from which we freed ourselves more than a hundred years ago, and are now too wise to lapse into slavery again; the other bathed in a brilliance the weak eyes of our people are not yet able to bear. Here, therefore, we should follow the middle road; but to that end we need civil servants with the brightest minds and purest enlightenment. Thus all we need to avoid the threat of imminent evil is a better schooling, and more complete instruction of the clergy of all religious faiths.

[...] What I have said about the Old Believers³ also applies in many respects to our own taxable people. You are their guardians and fathers. In the spirit of this age it is no longer appropriate to rule children by the rod alone, even less so when they are already approaching adulthood. The people must be brought up with love; then born enemies are transformed into grateful children and, if they are well instructed, into friends.

The people are more numerous than you; without them you lack sustenance and life. Therefore, show them due love, that they may feel attachment to you and to our constitution; uphold the rule of reason, wherever you may find it; demand from the people your customary basic taxes, but share with them the remaining public expenses; commend to the King every man who excels by his reason and actions, that nobility be conferred on him; and ensure that those convicted of criminal offences lose their rights, so that the words of St. Stephen⁴ may hold true: 'The only true nobleman is the one ennobled by deeds'. The invention of printing has facilitated enlightenment, so

³ By the term 'Old Believers' (*Cro. starovjerci*, *Ger. Altgläubige*) Drašković refers to Greek Orthodox believers, whose worship practices were considered older than the Roman Catholic ones.

⁴ Saint Stephen, the first Hungarian king, crowned on Christmas of the year 1000. Drašković's quotation may come from Stephen's *Admonitions*, addressed to his son Prince Imre (Emericus), where an ideal king is described.

take heed that no bright mind slips through your net. For if these enlightened individuals join your cause, and if they have good cause for satisfaction, you will reap benefits without toil. By contrast, as adversaries these same men are sure to do you harm when times are hard. Much can be said on this subject; judge it, I pray you, without the prejudice of our grandfathers. Our viewpoint is no longer the same as theirs; the demands of loyalty, justice and truth call for a different illumination from that required in the seventeenth century.

Translated by Robert Russell

EUDOVÍT ŠUHAJDA: MAGYARISM IN HUNGARY

Title: *Der Magyarismus in Ungarn in rechtlicher, geschichtlicher und sprachlicher Hinsicht, mit Berichtigung der Vorurteile, aus denen seine Annahmen entspringen* (Magyarism in Hungary from the aspect of law, history and language, with the correction of the prejudices that are the base of its conceits)

Originally published: Leipzig, Carl Drobisch, 1834

Language: German

Translated from the Slovak version: "Maďarizmus v Uhorsku z právnej, historickej a rečovej stránky," in Ján V. Ormis, ed., *O reč a národ. Slovenské národné obrany z rokov 1832–1848* (Bratislava: SAV, 1973), pp. 275–281.

About the author

Ludovít Matej Šuhajda [1806, Banská Štiavnica (*Ger.* Schemnitz, *Hun.* Selmečbánya, present-day Slovakia) – 1872, Banská Štiavnica]: Lutheran pastor, teacher and journalist. Born into a family of yeomen, Šuhajda worked for some time as a furrier. He studied at the Protestant seminary in his native town and in 1824 enrolled at the Lutheran lyceum in Pressburg (*Hun.* Pozsony, *Slo.* Prešporok, today Bratislava); later he continued his theological studies in Vienna and at the University of Jena. After 1830 he served as a chaplain in Banská Bystrica (*Ger.* Neusohl, *Hun.* Besztercebánya), and later taught at, and for some time was also headmaster of, the Lutheran lyceum in Banská Štiavnica, one of the most important cultural and educational centers of Upper Hungary. He was popular with the Slovak students at the lyceum for his publicistic work defending Slovak national rights and for his support of Slovak cultural and educational institutions. His essays defending the activities of Slovak students were also published in the Hungarian liberal *Pesti Hírlap*. In addition, Šuhajda wrote several articles dealing with literary criticism and poetry, and also published a number of his own sermons.

Main works: *Der Magyarismus in Ungarn in rechtlicher, geschichtlicher und sprachlicher Hinsicht, mit Berichtigung der Vorurteile, aus denen seine Annahmen entspringen* [Magyarism in Hungary from the aspect of law, history and language, with correction of the prejudices that are the base of its conceits] (1834); *Neue, historisch-kritische Ansicht über das asiatische Seyn und das erste europäische Thatenleber der Magyaren* [New critical-historical view on the Asiatic being

and the first European deeds of the Hungarians] (1837); *De natura poeseos suis in classe humanitatis auditoribus* [On the nature of poetry, to his students in the Humanities class] (1851); *Kázně* [Sermons] (1863).

Context

During the first decades of the nineteenth century the development of nationalism in East Central Europe led from an interest in national language and culture to national mobilization and the formulation of a national political program aiming at some form of territorialization. In Hungary, a strong, independent and unified state came to be the main aim of gentry liberalism, supported also by the nascent bourgeoisie and intelligentsia. Despite their disapproval of the democratization of the Hungarian political system, some of the magnates who rejected the centralist policies of the Habsburg Court joined the liberals in their opposition to Vienna. The common ideological platform of the opposition became the ‘extension of rights’ of the political nation (i.e. the nobility) to the non-privileged population, and this program was underpinned by the vision of a uniform and modern Hungarian nation comprising both Magyars and all the non-Magyar peoples living in the territory of ‘St. Stephen’s Crown.’ One of the crucial means of creating such a political community was considered to be the introduction of a common language into all spheres of public life. This effort led the Hungarian Diets of the 1830–1840s to promote Magyarization, especially in education and public administration.

In Upper Hungary, the Hungarian nation and state-building process started to clash with the growing Slovak national consciousness. In this situation, a new wave of ‘national apologies’ appeared (Pavol Senický, Michal Kuniš, Samuel Hojč, Ľudovít Šuhajda), which were mostly published abroad in the 1830s. These authors usually admitted the dominant position of the Hungarian language in the country and expressed their allegiance to the Hungarian state, to the establishment and defense of which, as they emphasized, the Slavs (and particularly the Slovaks) had contributed significantly in the past. Usually they also expressed sympathy with the democratizing and modernizing tendencies in the plans of the Hungarian reform movement. However, they criticized the policy of Magyarization, which in their view was poisoning the friendly coexistence among the nations in multi-ethnic Hungary. Inspired by German Romantic literature and its conception of the nation based on culture—mediated above all by **Ján Kollár**—they favored the theory of

natural rights (of man as well as of the national community) in contrast to the concept of historical rights promoted by the traditional Hungarian political discourse.

Besides the usual apologetic arguments, one finds in Šuhajda's text ideas and suggestions concerning the solution of the language controversies in Hungary. He opposed on principle the extension of any language by administrative measures. In his view, each language had a right to be used and extended only on the basis of its own attractiveness and usefulness. In the spirit of the German Romantic conception of nation, Šuhajda distinguished between the 'homeland' or 'state' as an artificial and replaceable category and the 'nation' as a natural given which demanded man's primary emotional engagement. Hence, for him the "nation" as defined by language—and thus of enduring nature—stood above the state. According to Šuhajda, the multi-ethnic Hungarian homeland consisted of eight regions populated by eight nations. The only possible way to guarantee the future of the common state was therefore a law-based union of all of these nations based on a political agreement.

The primary aim of the Slovak 'national apologies' was the reinforcement of the historical 'givens,' the most important of which was the national language, albeit as yet uncoded. At the same time, in these texts there is still missing the specific notion of 'Slovakness' and the particular narrative of Slovak national identity which was to be developed by **Ludovít Štúr's** generation in the coming decade. Nevertheless, Šuhajda in his text sought to raise the 'ethnic' nation to the position of a political subject, which was one of the key ingredients of the ensuing Slovak federalist discourse as applied in the Hungarian context. From this point of view, Šuhajda was also accepted by and integrated into the later national movement. In the revolutionary years of 1848–1849 these federalist incentives were adopted by the leading personalities of the Slovak national movement, who set the territorial autonomy of Slovakia within Hungary or the whole Habsburg Empire as their main goal.

PL-MK

Magyarism in Hungary

Of all oppressions, the most abhorrent is that which aims at the destruction of the language of a particular nation, for it attacks the popular basis and consequently the very dignity of the nation. This is the intention of the Hungar-

ian nobility and—according to our understanding—of the Hungarian nation as such. From the native nations of the country—the Slavs, who are divided here into Slovaks, Ruthenians, Slovenians, Croats, Slavonians, and Serbs and from other tribes, such as the Germans in Transylvania and in the major cities of Hungary, the Wallachians in the south, scattered Jews and Gypsies, and if there be any, from any additional ragged rabble, they want to make *loyal and enthusiastic Magyars*. This is to be done through the help of the Hungarian language, which will be forced upon the other nationalities of Hungary. Since it is in general deplorable to imitate foreign *mores* and habits, foreign ways and moods, since parroting testifies to the unhealthy and diseased spirit of the nation, it is most unjust and impermissible for any nation to demand from the inhabitants of any particular state the acquisition of its own language, way of thinking and lifestyle. The conquests of language are as unjust and damnable as are the conquests of land, even more damned, as language has far greater value for a man than land. How could any nation dare to force any other nation, even if in the same political state, to accept its language, its ways and *mores*, through the help of compulsory laws, which, as it is to be feared, will introduce inquisitorial trials over (the Hungarian) language. Language, the property of each and every nation, represents the *distinguishing feature of a nation*, its character, through which the soul of the community is expressed, even the very meaning of the nation. If, however, the language is obstructed and destroyed, the very humanity of man is wasted and he is made a spiritual slave. What type of tyranny could be more cruel, more difficult to bear, more hideous, and yes, more mean-minded than this despotic destruction and disgrace of the holiest rights of peoples and nations? [...]

Hungarians, you should become a proper nation in your own territory—do not become French, nor German, nor Slavs. But do not forget at the same time that our state consists of many languages, that each nation is independent and its rights are holy, that each has the right to the protection of its language, and that no nation is in any way obliged to grant to another nation its innermost essence, its self. [...]

We ask, therefore, those who attempt to Magyarize, who so often and so firmly praise the homeland and stress their patriotic duties: why cannot the love for the common homeland unite with the love for a particular nation and language? And if one has to choose: which would one love more, *homeland* or *nation*? Homeland could be found easily everywhere, nation and language are nowhere to be found. The former is cold, dead land, objectively existing and a rather distant mixture; the latter is our own blood, life, soul, subjectiv-

ity—that is, what we are. It is hard to understand how it is possible to forbid speaking in a certain language. Language means the communication of thoughts. It exists, therefore, between individuals and people who need or love each other; once they no longer want each other, each goes his own way and speaks to himself. The human soul cannot communicate with another human soul directly, but only indirectly, that is, through language. [...]

This is true for the sphere of everyday, common, technical and commercial life, in correspondence, friendship, industry, business and so on, everywhere where several nations are living in one state. In general, careful account must be taken of the fact that in a country which is composed of numerous nations, all the institutions must be run differently than in the case of a nation which lives in more than one state (Germany) or in the case of one nation forming one state. It can be proven that the last option is, from numerous perspectives, the most desirable. It would be the worthiest and most appropriate if states were formed in such a way as to cover the territory of a single nation. States should be divided not according to mountains, valleys, rivers or lakes, but according to language, which is both the tool and essence of the spiritual integrity of a nation. One nation should form one state, and one state should be formed by one nation. But this is merely an astute (rather than wise) principle of statecraft, which could be valid only for an area where there are no other obstacles, while still showing respect for the rational ideal of the eternal rights of nations. In those countries where historical necessity led to such a state of affairs and conditions that a number of nations must live next to each other under one power, a legal relationship must be established which is just to all parties, there must be tolerance for the aspirations in the educational sphere of each nation. The Hungarians must be left to continue their impressively started progress towards a cultivated language; the Slavs in Hungary must be allowed to use their language and unite in their literary language with the Czechs, Poles, Serbs and others; the Germans must be allowed to keep alive their mother tongue and to connect in literature with their fathers and brothers in Teutonia. In this way, they would all live peacefully, remembering their political homeland; they themselves would learn Hungarian, or at least those who aspire to be educated. Certainly, this will be naturally resolved. [...]

Hungary, in the narrow sense of the word, is composed of Carpatho-Slavia, Ruthenia, Magyaria [Maďaria], Wallachia, Serbia [Rácka], Croatia, Prekmurje [Vendsko] and Teutonia [Teutónsko]. Magyaria [Maďarsko] lies in the lowland; it is virtually surrounded by Slavonic nations. In no *legal* and in no *possible* way can it demand that the other nations of Hungary forget their old,

natural ethnic homeland and sacrifice their nationality to the political aims of reason of state; those goals are reachable if well thought over and properly proposed *even in a multinational state*. What would happen if the Slavs were to say: "This country has been for more than a thousand years, and still is inhabited predominantly by the Slavs, so, you non-Slavs who are in the minority should speak Slavonic. It is as much our country as it is yours."—"But we conquered the country!"—"Then enter into a legal relationship with us, as you are *no longer soldiers* but statesmen, lawyers and so on. For the sake of justice you should constitute such a community (state, *res publica*), which would satisfy a group of nations, people of different origin. Establish a union or something of similar nature; or if that seems impossible, cry: "Fall down, the favorite idol of our thoughts, turn into dust and ashes, the strange plan proposed in spheres of fantasies! There is nothing more beautiful than a justly governed state and nothing more dishonest than an unjust coercive state machinery that disrespects international law! And you, the nations of Pannonia, go to the east, go to the west, we have no advice for you, we have no idea how to build a just state composed of a plurality of nations! Go there where they respect international law more than artificial co-habitation; go away, as the treacherous Danube has always been an ill guardian of nationality." In this country, where every gift of nature finds root, grows, flowers and matures, here, the most precious fruit, law, does not seem to find a fertile soil.

Translated by Petr Roubal and Gordon MacLean

LAJOS MOCSÁRY: NATIONALITY

Title: *Nemzetiség* (Nationality).

Originally published: Pest, Ráth Mór, 1858

Language: Hungarian

The excerpts used are from the reprint (Budapest: Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó, 1987), pp. 126–132.

About the author

Lajos Mocsáry [1826, Kurtány – 1916, Andornak (northern Hungary)]: politician. His family was from the Protestant middle nobility of Upper Hungary. He studied at the Faculty of Arts of the University of Pest. During the revolution of 1848–49 he was taking a cure in the sanatorium at Gräfenberg (Lázně Jeseník, present-day Czech Republic), where he became a friend of **Miklós Wesselényi**. After the end of the revolution and the death of Wesselényi, he married his widow. He was active in the 1850–60s in the left wing of the Hungarian political opposition to Vienna, and became a member of Parliament in 1861. After the Compromise of 1867 he remained in opposition to the political system, and as a prominent figure of the Independence Party (from 1874 on) he was one of the most committed advocates of reconciliation between the nationalities of the country. He criticized the increasing chauvinistic tendencies of the government and eventually of his own party. In the 1888 elections he ran as a candidate of a preponderantly Romanian electoral district in Krassó-Szörény county (Banat). In 1892 he withdrew from parliamentary politics, but remained active in the political press until his death. His mantle was inherited by the civic radicals at the turn of the century, and he became a symbolic, though rather unexplored, figure of the tradition of attempted national reconciliations in the region.

Main works: *A magyar társasélet* [Hungarian social life] (1855); *Nemzetiség* [Nationality] (1858); *Programm a nemzetiség és a nemzetiségek tárgyában* [Program on the issues of nationality and the nationalities] (1860); *Néhány szó a nemzetiségi kérdésről* [Some words on the nationality question] (1886); *A régi magyar nemes* [The Hungarian nobleman of old times] (1889).

Context

The 1848–1849 revolutionary fight from the moment it ended supplied a crucial myth of ‘national unity’ in Hungarian politics; yet it was also a traumatic experience. The leadership of the Revolution was unprepared for the complex interplay of social and ethnic differentiation catalyzed by the revolutionary upheaval among the other (especially Serbian, Croatian, Slovak, Romanian and Transylvanian Saxon) nationalities, which altogether made up more than half of the total population of the country. Although these communities were also divided along social, political, and often denominational lines, claims to some sort of national self-government projected onto a territorial framework were articulated within all of them. Thus, in the event the Hungarian revolutionaries had to face not only the Austrian and Russian troops but also the mass movements of Croats, Serbs, Romanians and Slovaks, all seeking their national emancipation in opposition to the Hungarian project which adhered to the idea of one ‘political nation’ incorporating the various ethnicities.

Mocsáry’s essay, ‘Nationality,’ was an attempt to reconsider the national program of Hungarian liberalism in the light of this experience. In a fundamental breach with the classical conceptualization of political nationhood, he interpreted ‘nation’ as a community of people who are of the same origins, speak the same language, and consider themselves to be of the same kin: therefore, he conceded that in the territory of Hungary there was more than one nation (and in the text he explicitly mentioned the Slovak, Serb, Croat and Romanian nations). At the same time, arguing for the historical basis of nationhood, he sought to preserve the unity of ‘historical’ Hungary, stressing that there should be something even more generous and more altruistic than national sentiment: namely, patriotism—an allegiance not only to one’s own ethno-cultural community, but also to one’s country (which might thus involve different national groups).

In the pages of ‘Nationality,’ Mocsáry argues for the institutional advancement of this kind of patriotism and formulates an agenda of mutual concessions. On the one hand, Hungarians must restrain themselves from any aggression towards the other national communities of the country, thus conciliating them through generous-minded provision regarding matters of common interest. On the other hand, he tries to prove that the ‘centrifugal’ tendencies of the nationalities are not so strong as the clashes of the revolutionary years made them seem to be. Especially, he argues, the principal ‘shibboleth’ of Hungarian nationalists, Pan-Slavism, is not as unitary as it

might seem; it is rather a phantom created by frightened onlookers. In addition, he pointed out that the Slavs of the country also admitted the impossibility of creating a national movement without a historical basis, and this historical basis was extremely divergent in the case of different Slavic nations.

Thus, it is its common history that makes Hungary a *patria* for more than one nation. History creates a feeling of community, which is the only real basis of multi-national coexistence: "The Slavs of our country are closer to us than any of our philologically established linguistic relatives." Mocsáry recapitulates one of the crucial arguments of the Reform Age, claiming that the only country that provided "constitutional existence" to a Slavic population (i.e., the Slovaks) in the past was, in fact, Hungary. Thus, while the liberal nationalists of the forties were offering constitutionalism in return for assimilation, Mocsáry depicts the Hungarian constitutional tradition as the principal cause of the preservation of Slavic national existence. Along similar lines he deals with another favorite theme of the Reform Age discourse on nationality, the "Russian threat." Here too he tries to sooth the fears of the Hungarian public. Faithful to his Herderian convictions, he claims that imperialism contradicts nationalism, and thus he can conceptually separate the Slavonic national movements in Hungary from Russian interests.

In contrast to the other liberal attempts (most importantly, those of **József Eötvös**) to solve the nationality question after 1849, Mocsáry's conception of nationhood was not state-centric. Rather, it represents a variation on some of the key tenets of the Romantic nationalism of the Reform Age, although it was unusually open towards the symbolic incorporation of the other national communities living within the borders of historical Hungary. His doctrine was built on the conviction that peace and prosperous co-existence were not only compatible with, but in fact represented the core of any 'sincere nationalism.'

Altogether, Mocsáry's intellectual position was atypical, and his views on the nationality question did not have a powerful resonance in mainstream political discourse, even though his personal political importance as one of the leaders of the opposition was considerable. For a while the political activists of the various nationalities (especially the Romanians) subscribed to his ideas; but once they began to formulate their own 'nationalizing' agenda, Mocsáry's importance decreased. By the end of his life the emerging civic radical political movement (see **Oszkár Jászi**, *The future of the Monarchy*) regarded him as a symbolic figure of the anti-nationalist political discourse. After 1945 he was for a short period revived as a symbol of cooperation be-

tween the Hungarians and other Eastern European nations, but as the nationality questions of the region remained unsolved, his figure once again was marginalized.

BT

Nationality

It has been a thousand years that we have inhabited and possessed this land together, a thousand years that we have lived together, tilled its soil together and shared our sufferings and joys. Is it possible to show a single feat that can be said to have been achieved by Hungarians or by Slavs alone; hasn't everything been done by joint efforts? The troops that fought so valiantly against the Turks, the Tartars and so many other adversaries have always included Hungarians, Slovaks, Croatians, Serbs, Germans and Romanians as well, and many a Hungarian warlord has led Slavic troops to glory, just as Croatian and Serb commanders have achieved similar victories with Hungarian troops. And haven't they all served a common cause, with a common glory and lesser or greater success, and haven't they all regarded each other as brave sons of the same homeland, as valiant champions of the same cause? [...]

And let our Slavic kinsmen re-claim from us, if they please, all the heroes whom we take pride in and whom they profess to be from their race. We shall not be ashamed, even if they succeed in proving that Zrínyi¹ was not purely Hungarian, and that his and many other clans did not in fact spring from our race. This will not to the slightest degree lessen the reverence we cherish for them in our hearts. If our Slavic fellow-countrymen claim them, then let them accept as theirs all the exploits that these heroes performed: we are pleased to share with them the glory and shall not grudge them the laurels. The sole result of this sentiment will be that we shall see them and us as one, and regard all that we have from the past and the present as our common property.

¹ The name of an eminent south-west Hungarian noble family of Croatian background in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries. Miklós Zrínyi (Nikola Zrinski, 1508–1566) died heroically while defending the castle of Szigetvár against the Turks. His great-grandson of the same name (1620–1664) was a famous politician, military commander, political theoretician and the greatest Hungarian Baroque poet. His brother, Péter (Petar Zrinski) translated Miklós's literary epic, 'The peril of Sziget,' into Croatian. Subsequently, he was implicated in the anti-Habsburg conspiracy of the Hungarian estates and was executed in 1671.

Let scholars and linguists put us into separate columns, let them classify us into separate language families and say that our real kinsmen are wandering somewhere on the plateaux of Asia and shivering around the Arctic Sea, and that the Turks with whom we lived in such a pleasant fraternal harmony for centuries are in fact our dear kinsmen: we shall still reckon our Slavic compatriots to be more closely related to us. Even though we are classed as a separate group of people linguistically, we shall still hold dearer this long-standing proximity, friendship, compaternity and the intertwined branches of quasi-kinship than that other distant kinship that goes back to Adam and Eve.

It is unthinkable that our Slavic relatives could ever forget all these historical memories and extinguish from their bosom the sentiments that they evoke. And as soon as they take a historical point of view, they are ours. Yet without history there is no nationality; without it there may be an enthusiastic zeal for a language, there may be a temporary sense of irritation towards one or another race, but this is no genuine national sentiment, just an artificial movement labeled with some name, which can never be permanent and enduring.

Just as we reckon our Slavic compatriots to be more closely related to us than any of our linguistic relatives already discovered or to be discovered, likewise, soberly considered, they will surely hold us to be closer to themselves than the Russians, the Czechs and other Slavic tribes with whom they have had no real contact whatsoever save as foes. In a certain sense, it is a new discovery that they are kinsfolk, and why should mere fancy make them more concerned about their fate, their past and future than about ours, with whom they have lived in the closest contact for a millennium and about whose past deeds they may justly proclaim, as indeed they must, that “*quorum pars magna fui*.”²

And if they intend to form an independent nationality without joining others, where shall they obtain its independent historical fundament, when this historical fundament is used by another nationality to build upon. Or will they eradicate from their memory their entire historical past and return to the days wrapped in the hazy mist of legends and tales? What fundament can this provide for national enthusiasm? Can the sentiments of the bosom be thus impelled and mystified enduringly, and isn't it just skirting the boundaries of absurdity, a deviation from the simple and natural path of common sense?

² “In which I played a great part.” Vergilius, *Aeneis*, 2.6.

Looking at the past from yet another aspect, can it be that the memories of the past should rouse hostile emotions in their bosom? Which Slavic tribe, or the sons of which Slavic tribes have had a more auspicious fate than those who have lived in our homeland? That the Hungarian nobility used to have all the authority in this country – can this be regarded as a national grievance? After all, the nobility used to be the dominating class in each and every country. As much as the other classes of Hungary's population suffered from them, they shared this suffering, and the Hungarian peasants had to endure their yoke just as the Slavs did. But a major part of the nobility enjoying such rights and authority were Slavs, and but for Poland, Hungary was the only country where the Slavs could live a constitutional life. Only here could they practice Protestantism and gain through it rights, independence, political importance and self-government, all of which they were destitute of in other countries.

Whatever view we take about Protestantism, we cannot deny that it originated in the sentiment of and yearning for liberty. It was a peculiar and irresistible manifestation of this very sentiment. It was the name of Protestantism that was blazoned on the standards and the sentiment of freedom that nested in the bosoms. It was the work of this striving for freedom, if the peoples succeeded in attaining rights and legal standing, if they could inquire into the Word of the greatest authority of all, the Church, if they became free to participate in the management of the most sacred matters linking man to God: the matters of the Church. (...)

Only in Hungary could the Slavs partake of this majestic, large-scale and national education with its boundless moral consequences, an education that could not but have an ennobling and intense impact upon the character of a people. Here then is another link connecting us tighter than we would imagine; tighter than those newly fashioned, dreamt-up sympathies between the nationalities which can kindle a zealous enthusiasm and provoke imprudent demonstrations only in the most out-of-touch scholars as well as in a peasantry sunk into the deepest ignorance, but not in men with common sense. This link leads back directly into the shared history of our homeland, to those magnificent struggles which, like mighty pulse-beats of our often waning and nearly swooning national life, stand in common between our histories. We do not demand our Slavic compatriots to thank us Hungarians for this gain; we do not claim to have been the ones who attained it for them and then, having attained it, handed it over to them as a gift. Nay, we know full well that they fought in company with our forefathers on this and other occasions; we do not boast, we do not wish to attribute the merit of these struggles to our-

selves. All we want to point out is that we have achieved this and so much else together, and that here indeed is a common endeavor, a common task again, here is a link joining us once more.

But in more recent times, when the struggles for liberty are no longer about abstruse denominational questions but more practical issues, where have the Slavs tasted the sweet, albeit sometimes deceptive fruits of the spirit of freedom and reform other than in Hungary? The other Slavs as yet knew nothing at all about these concepts when they were already becoming the subject of public reflection and public debates here, with an elevating and ennobling effect on their character that is still discernible now that the questions themselves have long been swept aside from the forum of debate. Only here did the Slavs have an opportunity for this more elevated, this nobler spiritual preoccupation.

But, more importantly, where have the Slavs enjoyed a constitutional life for centuries outside Hungary? Even if this advantage was not general, being the lot of only a privileged class: where else were they able to attain even this much? Only the Slavs of Hungary can have a notion about what a centuries-long constitutional life is, only among them has a constitutional outlook been embedded deep in their minds, thus granting them the spiritual aptitude that is the surest guide for a people towards developing a real sensitivity for what is the single precondition of a permanent, partly liberal and partly conservative national spirit. It is most imperative and most important for all of us that this notable aspect of our history and present situation should be carefully considered and duly appreciated by all who speak to the Slavic peoples, and particularly our Slavic compatriots, about their past, present and future as well as the claims they are entitled to make towards the world and us. If I may express it thus, the Slavs have nowhere, with the possible exception of Poland, enjoyed so fine a life as under the Hungarian crown. For it appears that bondage and the state of servitude were the ill fate and destiny of this great race which constitutes a substantial part of the whole of mankind. I say ill fate; far be it from me the presumption that they do not possess just as many loftier spiritual qualities and susceptibilities as any other race. I do not claim that they have only us Hungarians to thank for the aforementioned advantage; I do not say that we gave them, let alone forced on them liberty, for as I have already stressed several times, all we have has been earned together and is our common property: but this detracts nothing from the truth and merit of the fact at issue.

Translated by Dávid Oláh

STEFAN BUSZCZYŃSKI: THE FUTURE OF AUSTRIA

Title: *Przyszłość Austrii: Rozwiązanie kwestii słowiańskiej przez B.* (The future of Austria: A solution to the Slavic question, by B.)

Originally published: Cracow (at the cost of the author), 1869. An enlarged and revised version appeared in 1892 in Vienna, under the title: *Krieg oder Frieden? Versuch einer Entscheidung dieser Frage von S. B. Kriegfeind, Vertheidiger der Menschenrechte.*

Language: Polish

Excerpts used are from the original edition, pp. 3–25.

About the author

Stefan Buszczyński [1821, Młodkowce (*Ukr.* Młodkovci, present-day Ukraine) – 1892, Cracow]: journalist and literary critic. Buszczyński graduated from Kiev University. For a period he lived the calm life of a member of the country gentry. However, in 1863–1864 he participated in the January uprising, and after its defeat he was forced to emigrate to France. For some time he worked there as a publicist, but later he moved to Galicia. Buszczyński advocated the Polish cause and the principles of democracy and produced several, more or less unrealistic, projects of European federation. Later on, he turned his attention to problems related not only to the Habsburg dynasty and the Slavic nations but the entire world, developing the so-called *Noarchy* project, where all nations and individuals would find happiness and peace. On the ‘home front’ his critical writings on Polish developments targeted the liberal conservative ‘Cracow-school’ and positivist philosophy. He was also active as a literary critic, dealing mostly with Polish romantic poetry. His *oeuvre*, even in its exaggerations, is quite representative of the cultural atmosphere of late Romanticism; nevertheless, Buszczyński is virtually unknown even to Polish readers.

Main works: *Podole, Wołyń, Ukraina* [Podolia, Wolhynia, Ukraine] (1862); *La décadence de l’Europe* (1867); *Pol i jego pisma* [Pol and his writings] (1873); *Le catéchisme social* (1876); *Rachunek polskiego sumienia: Rozmyślanie w niewoli* [Polish self-examination: Meditations in slavery], (1883); *Posłannictwo Słowian i odrębność Rusi: Rzut oka na Słowiańszczyznę* [The Slavic destiny and the separation of Ukraine: A glance at Slavic lands] (1885); *Krieg oder Frieden? Versuch einer Entscheidung dieser Frage von S. B. Kriegfeind, Vertheidiger der Menschenrechte* [War or Peace? An attempt at solving this question by S. B., the Enemy of War, Defender of Human Rights] (1892); *Obrona spotwarzzonego narodu* [Defense of the offended nation]

(1888–1894); *Nad brzegiem Lemanu* [On the banks of the Leman] (1895); *Czy rewolucja w Europie potrzebna jest i możliwa?* [Is the revolution in Europe needed and possible?] (1895).

Context

From 1861 onwards, with the fall of neo-absolutism and the beginning of the constitutional period in Austria, the situation of Poles under Austrian rule considerably improved, and autonomy was granted to Galicia. It was given an elective legislature (*Sejm Krajowy*) and a provincial executive body (*Wydział Krajowy*). It is probably due precisely to their privileged position that, in the second half of the 1860s, Polish politicians did not support the Czech pro-federalist conception in the debate on the Austro-Hungarian *Ausgleich*. Instead, further political interventions of the Galician political elite, supported by public manifestations, led to the acceptance of the Polish language in schools, courts and in the Jagiellonian University of Cracow. A ‘Ministry of Galician Affairs’ was created in Vienna, and the Academy of Sciences was launched in Cracow under the patronage of the Habsburg family.

These achievements were all the more spectacular in comparison to the markedly less favorable situation of the Poles in Russia and Prussia. The refractory reaction to the Czech ‘politics of absence’ was caused by the hopes attached to the future of the Habsburg Empire as a possible counter-balance to Russia. There was no doubt that Galicia was the only part of the former Commonwealth where Poles were allowed, to a certain extent, to exert self-government. Comparison with the politics of ruthless Russification after the defeat of the January uprising (1863–1864) led to clear conclusions: it was only Galicia that could play the role of a Polish Piedmont.

Stefan Buszczyński’s ideas, although very far from being realistic political calculations, bear traces of a common conviction of mid-nineteenth century Polish politicians about the character of Austria and its destiny. According to the Cracow conservatives, the Habsburgs might be capable of fulfilling the role, once played by Poland, of the ‘Bulwark of (Western) Christendom’—this time against tyrannical Russia. Therefore, a close Polish-Austrian co-operation was considered unavoidable. Buszczyński’s originality was to combine this program with the romantic belief in Slavic unity. Hence, he advocated a hypertrophic version of Austro-Slavism (as formulated by **Fran-tišek Palacký**), namely, a purely Slavic Habsburg Empire, without German, Romanian and Hungarian areas. He ignored the fact that the Habsburgs

themselves belonged to the non-Slav part of the Empire. Buszczyński also omitted to describe ways to prevent territorial conflicts between the prospective members of the federation, nor did he foresee inclusion of any other new territories except for those of former Poland.

These logical gaps in Buszczyński's treatise revealed the main underlying idea of the thinker. His federalist ideology was in many respects rather an anti-Russian manifesto than the result of a pan-European conviction. Along these lines, he asserted the Finno-Ugrian origin of the Russians. From that point of view they were naturally excluded from any plans for Slav co-operation. That also—as Buszczyński believed—deprived pan-Slav ideology of any logic. His 'Habsburg Slavic' empire was therefore an answer to the pan-Slavists—one not less absurd than pan-Slavism itself.

Buszczyński's project did not have a practical impact on Polish federalist ideology. On the contrary, the vast stream of plans created during the 1905–1907 revolution concentrated on the federalization of the Russian Empire, based on the idea of Slavic brotherhood. Nevertheless, the majority of Polish formulations of federalist ideology in the nineteenth century shared the main feature of his project: they all understood federalism as a way to the eventual restoration of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (see: **Józef Piłsudski**, *Address in Vilnius*).

MG

The Future of Austria: A Solution to the Slavic Question, by B.

[...] There is no Austrian nation. Austria is a name without substance, a form without content, and an empty title. [...] Austria is surrounded by enemies on both sides. The Emperor of Austria is not concerned with Austria itself, but with the crown, with keeping his family on the throne. If he is not, he should be, considering his position.

Dynasty as an idea is in decline; the nineteenth century will witness it buried altogether. Does it then follow that dynasties will soon fall? No.

There are no sudden leaps in the history of the world. I cannot be certain about the future. Today, though, dynasties have an all the more splendid—since it is more dignified—possibility. Today, monarchs should choose between their own and their nations' interests. [...] If rulers understand the spirit of the times and the needs of nations, they will try to stay on the throne for the sake of their subjects; and vice versa, when nations see their monarchs

respecting their rights, it will be in their own interest to preserve the reigning dynasties.

There can be no stronger base for a dynasty than a close relationship with its nation. While one dynasty will not help another unless it can gain something from it, every nation will sacrifice anything for the royal family to which it feels strongly bonded owing to its just rule.

The most splendid future (among all the monarchic families in Europe) awaits the Habsburg dynasty, if it can only assess its current situation properly and is willing to make use of it. [...]

Let us consider the groups comprising the so-called Austro-Hungarian state. According to official statistics, there are:

7.50 million Germans	}	12.75 million
5.25 million Hungarians		
15.00 million Slavs		
3.50 million Romanians		
1.25 other nationalities		
32.50 million in total		

[...] Naturally, it is in the interest of the ruling dynasty to seek the support of the majority. But there is another factor to be considered here, namely, the moral attitude. It is beyond doubt that the Austrian-German spirit drifts towards the German motherland with which it wants to unite. By separating from Austria, the Germans would lose nothing, whereas the subjects of Habsburgs of other nationalities have their own interest in preserving that dynasty as protection from the Russian Tsar's greed.

Here is the essence of the common interest of the Habsburgs and their subjects of non-Germanic origin. [...]

However, in order to ensure that the relationship between the two sides is honest and lasting, their mutual rights need to be specified. [...] They can be formulated in the following manner: the rights to the crown on the one hand, and national rights on the other.

[...] All national rights can be reduced to the following two basic rights: self-government and national property. Therefore, each country that has its history, traditions, habits, language, attire, etc. has the right to be governed by the representatives of the nation to which it belongs.

All self-governments form the government of the highest instance, which can be represented by the head of the dynasty. [...]

A union, i.e. a federation of countries and provinces that constitute a State, can be the result of the autonomy of its constituents. [...] Only a federation of nations can save Europe from wars and despotism; a federation of countries that make up the Austrian monarchy can only save those countries and the Habsburg dynasty from Russian or other invasion. The fundamental condition for every international union is not only autonomy; it is essential that this union not be forced, but is the result of the nations' free will and is based on mutual agreement, otherwise it would not be international. [...]

No one can deny that the Russian invaders are a threat both to the nations of Austria and to the monarchy. The threat to the monarchy could become even more serious should Prussia adopt a hostile attitude towards Austria. [...] Let us not delude ourselves. Austria could share the fate of Poland. *Hodie mihi, cras tibi.*

How can this be prevented?

[...] The Habsburg dynasty should once and for all renounce the German traditions with which it is related today only through its seven million German subjects. Its great and—I would add—practical mission is to unite and liberate all Slavic nations. It should renounce its rule over the 3.5 million Romanians, whose destiny is to form a union with Moldavia, Wallachia, and Bessarabia to create a southern stronghold against the Russian invasion. It should even renounce Vienna, since the natural residence for the representative of the Union of Slavic Nations is Cracow, situated in the center. [...]

This way all Slavic nations would defend the Habsburgs, they would protect Europe from Asian invaders; this way the Habsburgs, who would guarantee the freedom and national rights of the peoples living by the Dvina, Dnieper, Danube, Elbe, Odra, and Vistula could save Europe.

Translated by Zuzanna Ładyga

SVETOZAR MILETIĆ: THE EASTERN QUESTION

Title: *Istočno pitanje* (The Eastern Question)

Originally published: In the journal *Srbski dnevnik* (Novi Sad) 1863, No. 174, 176–7, 179–80, 182, 184–5, 188

Language: Serbian

The excerpts used are from Svetozar Miletić, *O srpskom pitanju* (Novi Sad: Gradska biblioteka, 2001), pp. 105–109.

About the author

Svetozar Miletić [1826, Mosorin (*Srb.* Mošorin, Vojvodina) – 1901, Versec (*Srb.* Vršac, Vojvodina)]: politician and journalist. After attending the Gymnasium in Újvidék (*Srb.* Novi Sad), Miletić continued his education in Pest and Pozsony (today Bratislava, Slovakia), with financial and moral support from the Bishops Josif Rajačić and Jovan Hadži-Stević. There he came into contact with Pan-Slavic ideas, mainly due to the influence of **Ludovít Štúr** and **Ján Kollár**. During the Revolution of 1848, he appealed for the national liberation and unification of the South-Slavs. Having obtained a doctorate in law in Vienna after the Revolution, he turned his attention to Serbian politics in the Monarchy. He was elected mayor of Novi Sad in 1861, and in 1864 was elected a deputy to the Serbian People's and Church Assembly and in 1865 to the Hungarian Parliament. Miletić was one of the founders and protagonists of the influential political newspaper *Srbski dnevnik* (Serbian Chronicle) (1859–1864) and, from 1866, of *Zastava* (Banner), which became the leading newspaper of the Serbs in Hungary. He was one of the founders and a prominent member of United Serbian Youth, and also the founder and leader of the Serbian National Liberal Party (*Srpska narodna slobodoumna stranka*). Miletić incurred the wrath of the Serbian Church hierarchy over his bid to turn the institutions of church autonomy into instruments of modern nationalism. A strong proponent of liberal nationalism, he advocated the Serbian irredenta during the rebellion in Herzegovina in 1875. For his public activities he was imprisoned twice by the Hungarian authorities. Yet he remained equally critical towards the anti-democratic tendencies inside Serbia, especially the politics of the ruling Obrenović dynasty. He withdrew from political life in 1883.

Main works: *Na Tucindan* [Before Christmas] (1860); *Istočno pitanje* [The Eastern Question] (1863); *Značaj i zadatak srpske omladine* [The importance and the task of the Serbian Youth] (1866); *Federalni dualizam* [Federal dualism] (1866);

Osnova programa za srpsku liberalno-opozicionu stranku [The basis of the program of the Serbian liberal-opposition party] (1869); *O obrazovanju ženskinja* [On the education of women] (1871).

Context

Svetozar Miletić was one of the most influential ideological and political leaders of the Serbs living in the Habsburg lands. His enthusiasm for the ideas of liberal nationalism started during the 1840s, when he became acquainted with Pan-Slavic ideas. In 1848 Miletić figured as an editor of a magazine called *Slavjanka*, in which Serbian students in Hungary championed their ideas of national freedom. Miletić, full of revolutionary ardor, used to call himself the “Serbian **Kossuth**.” He was deeply disappointed with the outcome of the Revolution of 1848, which he considered a failed opportunity for attaining national liberation. For a while he retreated from public life, and set to finish his studies. He entered the political arena again in 1860, when the Austrian neo-absolutist regime was tentatively replaced by a constitutional one.

In his numerous articles published for *Srbski dnevnik*, Miletić eloquently explained the basic elements of his national-liberal conceptions which became the policy of the newspaper itself. In a famous article, ‘Before Christmas,’ written as a reaction to the decision of Francis Joseph to abolish the administrative autonomy of the Serbian Vojvodina and the Banat, Miletić discussed the issue of the political autonomy of Vojvodina, which remained one of the strategic political issues for the Serbian National Liberal Party, founded in 1869. Miletić inserted the issue of the Serbs into the broader framework of the so-called ‘Eastern Question.’ This question focused on the imminent dissolution of ‘Turkey in Europe,’ which Miletić and his contemporaries predicted. Miletić wrote the series of articles, entitled ‘The Eastern Question,’ for *Srbski dnevnik* and later had it also included among the founding documents of the Serbian National Liberal Party in its ‘Becserek Program’ of 1869. Allegedly, the theoretical frame and basic input for the further elaboration of the ideas on ‘The Eastern Question’ came from Miletić’s party colleague Mihajlo Polit-Desančić. A year before, Polit-Desančić had published a detailed study on the question of nationalities in Hungary and the ‘Eastern Question’ in the Viennese newspaper *Ost und West*. In their proposed solution, Miletić and Polit-Desančić went so far as to suggest the creation of a confederation of the Balkan peoples after their liberation from Ottoman rule. The idea was welcomed by the radical Bulgarian political leader,

Liuben Karavelov, who ardently championed the creation of a 'Balkan federation' as part of the 'United States of Europe'. On the other hand, Miletić's political opponents, led by Đorđe Stratimirović (1822–1908), who were closely connected with the clerical-conservative circles in Vojvodina and tried to maintain good relations with the Austrian authorities, did not agree with this political solution or, better put, such political fantasies. The official circles in Vienna abhorred radical political schemes regarding the "sick man on the Bosphorus," anticipating that the issue of the "sick man on the Danube," namely, Austria itself, might be next placed on the political agenda.

In general, Miletić's political project had liberal and radical tendencies. He supported radical methods that would lead to the liberation and unification of all the Serbs, wherever they lived, connecting the program of irredentism with social and political reformism or "the unification of all Serbs"—as he put it—"whether on this or that part of the Sava and Drina, whether living under oppression or with an illusion of having freedom." Miletić pleaded for diverse methods of political struggle, parliamentary as well as clandestine, including also armed struggle. As a staunch fighter for "nationality, freedom and equality," he stood closer to the national democrats than to the classical liberals.

In 'The Eastern Question' he considered the possibility of an armed rebellion of the Christian peoples of the Balkans against Turkey and their subsequent association into a Balkan Confederation. The article was written one year after the Serbian-Turkish clashes culminating in the bombardment of Belgrade in 1862, and Miletić expressed his regret that yet another opportunity—as after 1848 and 1859—had been missed to begin an uprising. Miletić believed that the Christian peoples, and particularly the Serbs, had to be ready for a general rising and unification which would bring them "salvation" and save them from becoming "mere colonies" of "foreign powers."

In the first three sections of the article, Miletić presents the history of the "Eastern Question." Then he analyzes the factors that had accelerated or impeded the solving of the Question; he further describes the chances of the Balkan nations for liberation after the Paris Treaty of 1856 and criticizes the Russian policy towards this issue. Finally, in the concluding two sections Miletić presents his opinions on a possible agreement between four Balkan nations—the Serbs, the Bulgarians, the Romanians, and the Greeks—and on the conditions under which Turkish rule in the Balkans could be abolished. Analyzing the political interests of these nations, he describes their "national characteristics," their potentials and inner strengths which in his opinion could justify their struggle for national liberation and the establishment of

independent national states. He presents two modes of establishing state connections—a federal model for a Serbian-Bulgarian alliance, and another one based on a confederation which could encompass all the four countries. Historians and political analysts have read ‘The Eastern Question’ as Miletić’s anticipation of what was to become political reality after the Berlin Congress in 1878. However, the actual outcome of the Congress was far from his vision of self-determination and unification of South-Slavic countries, and was an outcome of the geopolitical interests of the Great Powers.

Miletić withdrew from political life in 1883, at the time when different political options were already being clearly articulated within the Serbian National Liberal Party. In 1881, when he attended the party conference for the last time, the differences and divisions between the liberal and the radical wing of the party were becoming obvious. Eventually, in the mid-1880s, the Serbian National Liberal Party ceased to exist, its members in Vojvodina split into a liberal camp led by Miša Dimitrijević and Mihajlo Polit-Desančić, and radicals led by Jaša Tomić. This separation went hand in hand with the transformation of the political-ideological framework in Serbia, undermining the dominance of liberalism and opening up the space for a new, increasingly anti-liberal ethno-protectionist nationalist discourse.

IE

The Eastern Question

[...] The Serbs, Bulgarians, Hellenes and the Romanians—these are the four peoples in Eastern Europe and in European Turkey whose task it is to build independent states on the ruins of the Turkish Empire, in Europe, that is.

[...] Therefore the following questions arise: Firstly, do these nations have the right to their own liberation, that is, the right to revolt against Turkey? Secondly, do they possess the kind of interior organization necessary to maintain and enjoy statehood and sovereignty? Thirdly, what conditions need to be fulfilled for these people to live in harmony, and is that harmony likely? Thus, we shall arrive at the question of which and what manner of states would these be and what would become of the ruins of Turkey in Europe as well as in Asia and Africa, or what would be the best solution to the Eastern Question considering all the aforementioned factors and the interests of the Christian nations—the interests of the rest of Europe.

[...] The forces of the Congress have only now, in 1856, included Turkey among the European states, but have also, as was said before, included in the

body of international law a clause of special intervention in Turkey on their behalf. There is no settlement between the Cross and the Crescent; since the battles of Kosovo, Marica and Constantinople, the Serbian, Bulgarian and Hellenic peoples as such have made neither peace nor settlement with the Turks, and therefore they have the right to rebellion as long as there is a single Turk left in Europe.

The right itself is but the formal aspect of the national question; the true justification of a rebellion lies in whether the nation itself possesses life force, whether it has the moral, educational and material ability and strength, having overthrown one oppressor, to establish, sustain and develop something new; for if the people, having cast off the yoke of foreign tyranny, should remain in or relapse under the yoke of ignorance, wickedness and wantonness, warring amongst themselves, and thus into the yoke of either domestic tyranny or domestic anarchy, much as such a people loved its yoke, but since there is solidarity and there are mutual ties among all the states and nations in Europe, and since it is their rightful interest not to let a bad situation be replaced by an equally bad or even worse one and to give the opportunity for the intervention of some force or other which would give rise to international instability: thus would such immature nations be prevented from liberating themselves or would be, on liberating themselves from the Turks, cast under another yoke. This leads us to our second question.

The Christian peoples in the Turkish Empire have all the characteristics which signify ability and inner strength for an all-embracing moral and material culture. As Christians they have inherited the general religious-moral basis on which European culture was built. The Hellenes are a shrewd, broad-minded, agile and industrious people, especially in commerce, which is their main occupation; they have not only spiritual support in their classical literature, but they also have a beautiful and well-developed modern literature fostered by the Greek state, as well as by their public schools and institutions of higher education and their general educational and material institutions.

The same, only to a lesser extent, applies to the Romanians too: the simple Romanian folk is comparatively the most neglected and the aristocracy the most morally corrupt, yet the moral strength which brought them to unite against so many foreign and domestic obstacles, indicates that there is moral fiber in the nation yet and that there are more of those who seek to lead the nation towards a more noble and educated life.

The Bulgarians are a hard-working, industrious, sensible and persevering people with many social virtues. They are skillful at agriculture, and although

circumstances prevent them from nurturing a higher degree of culture at home, there are few places where public schools manage to achieve such success, the people being quick to learn and gifted, and able to reach a high level of education, as can be seen in some of their people educated abroad. They do not tolerate tyranny, and their good nature and calm air shows that they do not support anarchy either.

The Serbs are a witty, gifted, heroic people, able to become passionate about a higher idea and lay down their lives for it, and could, with a little more constancy and diligence, which can be cultivated with further cultural development, stand side by side with the best of nations. The literature of the free Serbs, which will instill passion and provide a support to others until they liberate themselves, is indeed highly developed. However, the main point is that all Christians have the salient point—*punctum saliens*—of every higher organism, and this is their national consciousness as the spiritual basis of a nation and political consciousness as the basis of statehood. They have one common thought which unites them and which removes all obstacles in times of crises, an immovable point that rules over all the movement of national life and does not allow it to break out of its perimeter. That point is a profound feeling that they are a people which has a past and is worthy of the future—a profound feeling for their mission in the history of European culture and the tendency to draw on and focus their energy and inclinations, no matter how different they might be, on a great thought. The feeling of pride and glory, the feeling of national freedom, both external regarding the state and internal regarding politics and the constitution, can uplift Christian peoples to the highest level of self-sacrifice. The source of rapture for Christian peoples is not the destructive fanaticism of the Turks, but the will to create—a creative spiritual force. [...]

Peoples such as the Serbs, Greeks and Romanians, who are able to perform such national and political actions without shedding a drop of domestic blood, are certainly mature enough for statehood—and it is only due to the territorial limitations of Serbia and Greece, as well as the fact that the limbs of their peoples have been torn off, that the spirit of the entire nation does not have the opportunity to work on its national and political development. These limitations, and those of a material nature, which were supported by diplomacy until now and which have so far benefited some domestic high officials for the purpose of their self-preservation, are to blame for the fact that life in the state of these nations has not yet shown itself in a better light and blossomed into full bloom. And to pierce this crust of confinement was exactly what the latest Serbian and Greek movements sought to do. Therefore, when

we see the struggle of the Serbs and the Greeks in European Turkey and in Greece to pierce this crust of confinement, which also means liberating their Christian brothers for their own sake, the question is, whether there is any unity among them, since without accord they are unlikely to succeed against Turkey on their own, let alone with European diplomacy, which would consider any uprising as mere rioting. In this case we presume that Serbia and Montenegro will be in agreement, for even if their governments disagree, the people will be as one, and woe betide him, the voice of the people should reach all the way to heaven for him, who would oppose the voice of the people.

Translated by Krištof Bodrič

ION C. BRĂȚIANU: NATIONALITY

Title: *Naționalitate* (Nationality)

Originally published: in *Republica română* (Brussels, 1853) vol. I, no. 2.

Language: Romanian

The excerpts used are from *Din scrierile și cuvântările lui Ion C. Brătianu, 1821–1891* (Bucharest: Carol Göbl, 1903), pp. 39–40, 59–61.

About the author

Ion Constantin Brătianu [1821, Pitești (Wallachia) – 1891, Florica (near Pitești)]: politician. He was the scion of an old boyar family. After being educated at home, Brătianu became in 1835 a member of the newly created Muntenian national militia. In 1841 he joined his brother in Paris, and studied at the Collège de France, where (along with many other Romanian students) he came under the influence of Jules Michelet (1798–1874), Edgar Quinet (1803–1875), and **Adam Mickiewicz** (1798–1855). He was a member of several Masonic lodges and had close contacts with the émigré leaders of other East European nationalities. He participated in the French revolution of 1848, establishing ties with Alphonse de Lamartine (1790–1869). In 1848 he returned to Wallachia and became one of the leaders of the revolution. After the defeat of the revolution he went into exile in France, where he stayed until 1857. From 1857 to 1859 he was a member of the National Assembly of Wallachia (the so-called ‘Divanul ad-hoc’) that voted for the union of Wallachia with Moldavia in 1859. From 1866 until his death in 1891 Brătianu participated in the most important political events of the new state, such as the instauration of the Hohenzollern dynasty (after the abdication of Prince Alexandru Ioan Cuza, in May 1866, Prince Carol of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen became the new ruler of Romania), the drafting of the constitution of 1866, the independence of Romania (1878) and the proclamation of the Romanian Kingdom (1881). Although for a short period after 1866 Brătianu manifested republican sympathies, after 1876 he became a loyal supporter of King Carol and his politics. He was repeatedly appointed Prime Minister and Minister of Interior. In 1876, together with C. A. Rosetti (1816–1885), he formed a Liberal cabinet, which remained in power until 1888. In 1883, he supported Romania’s adherence to the Triple Alliance. After 1883 Brătianu acted as the undisputed leader of the Liberal Party. In 1888 he withdrew from the government, but remained an opposition politician until his death in 1891. Brătianu established a dynasty of politicians whose existence became synonymous with the history of the Liberal Party in Romania. He is celebrated as the father of Romanian liberalism and one of the ‘architects of modern Romania.’

Main works: *Mémoire sur l'empire d'Autriche* (1855); *Mémoire sur la situation de la Moldo-Valachie* (1857); *Instrucțiunea publică* [Public education] (1865); *La Question religieuse en Roumanie* (1866); *Memoriu* [Memoir] (1901).

Context

The Romanian 'generation of 1848' considered the West and 'civilized' Europe as their political and cultural model. These intellectuals argued that the Western pattern of development should be introduced into the Danubian Principalities. Their ideas about politics were greatly influenced by the European liberal doctrines of the mid-nineteenth century, liberal nationalism being the political ideology they considered the most suitable for a modern Romanian state.

In *Le Peuple* (1846) Jules Michelet advanced one of the most influential theories of liberal nationalism produced in the nineteenth century. The book discusses the economic and political transformations endured by Europe as it evolved from an agrarian to an industrial society. Using France as an example, Michelet suggested that modernization and industrialization generated political and ideological conflict. Harmony in society was disrupted. Michelet's invocation of a natural balance and order in society was not, however, an indication of a conservative turn in his thinking, but served to introduce one of his main ideas about the role of the nation in history. Michelet saw the love of one's country as the cure to many existing problems. He invoked the innate goodness of the masses and considered 'the people' as the source of progress in history.

Michelet's ideas about the people reverberated in the thinking of the Romanian leaders of the Revolution of 1848. They equated progress and modernity with Western European civilization, but were pragmatic enough not to overlook the fact that the majority of the Romanians were peasants. The idea that the nation resides within the people enabled them to integrate the traditional culture of the Romanian peasants into the long-term project of institutional and political modernization. The sovereignty of the people served not only as a principle for nascent Romanian liberalism but also for the formulation of a nationalist doctrine.

Equally important in shaping Brătianu's ideas about the nation, the people and the role of national leaders was Giuseppe Mazzini (1805–1872), a leading figure of Italian liberal nationalism. Mazzini described the principle of nationality as one of the formative forces of the modern world, composed of natural elements such as language and ethnic origin, and moulded into the

consciousness of the people by education. This theory of the nation was based on the assumption that ethnic groups were intrinsic parts of nature. This form of nationalism, therefore, combined two traditions: the Romantic idea of the innate propensities of a nation, and the liberal notions of individual equality and transnational unity.

Brătianu's theory of the nation combined Michelet's and Mazzini's views on the natural tendency of individuals to associate in larger groups—such as family, tribe and nations—according to their interests and physical conditions with Romantic ideas about the permanence of ethnic characteristics. No political regime could deny a nation's freedom and right to existence. The rights of a nation derived, Brătianu claimed, from the rights of men that were by definition individual and universal. They were also the creation of nature. The stress on the unity of nature led Brătianu to see nations, too, as part of a great organic whole. Nations were not only the result of cultural and political activity but also communities of biological descent. It was in this context that Brătianu regarded race as the prime repository of the physical traits of both individuals and nations.

During the nineteenth century various nuances, connotations and meanings became associated with the concept of race. Interpretations of race multiplied, but they did not necessarily harmonize with each other. In many ways, this is partly explained by the fact that scientists and philosophers regularly conflicted over explaining human diversity.

Brătianu's explanation of the concept of race illustrates his familiarity with the debate about racial types characterizing the natural sciences at the beginning of the nineteenth century. He was especially influenced by the theories of racial categorization of mankind proposed by the German naturalist, Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752–1840), one of the founders of modern anthropology, whose subdivision of races he followed. Nevertheless, Brătianu did not use the concept of race for national identification but to indicate the natural condition of a nation. Race, he believed, explained the character of individuals, the structure of social communities, but racial characteristics dissolved into the nation.

Devoted to the liberal principles of equality and unity, Brătianu saw all nations as part of the great chain of being, with the most advanced of them leading the way towards universal progress and civilization. Like most of his contemporaries, Brătianu believed that European culture, especially in its French form, was the highest form of civilization. The 'racial discourse' was thus used by Brătianu to establish a symbolic connection between the Romanians and French civilization based on the fact that both Romanian and

French were Romance languages and also stressing the undeniable influence France had on the formation of modern Romanian culture.

Closely connected to the issue of civilization was the idea of progress, which Brătianu derived from the principles of the French Revolution. He thus suggested that freedom, democracy and parliamentary government would eventually be introduced into the Danubian Principalities as well. The Revolution of 1848 convinced the Romanians, Brătianu believed, that the principles of democratic revolution and nationalism were the guiding forces of the new Europe, an order based on the primacy of the nation-state. For Brătianu the nation-state was a precondition of a constitutional-democratic order. This relationship marked not only his political activity, but also the evolution of Romanian liberalism. Many of Brătianu's ideas about the nation and the state were incorporated into the political programs of the Liberal Party and materialized in its political achievements. Brătianu and his liberal legacy served as a constant source of inspiration for the modernist program of national development in Romania between 1860 and 1940.

MT

Nationality

Nationalities and races are natural and constitutive elements of mankind, and therefore necessary for its development. However, in 1848 the Hungarians wanted to Magyarize the Slavs and the Romanians. The first condition for a people to exist is to live in freedom as a nation. Each of the notions of nationality, liberty and democracy are interrelated. The definition of the revolution supports the reorganization of Europe into nations, [...] so that from each nation, in its entirety, the solidarity of all the peoples of Europe should emerge, and thus the unity of a universal republic should come into being. In such times, the issue of nationalities and races is one of the most controversial. Some deny them, so far as to annihilate them, while others believe in them, so far as to sacrifice everything for them. In order to establish the new order of things in Europe, this debate must be clarified. Are nationalities and races natural and necessary elements of mankind, or merely ephemeral forms, resulting from ignorance and some abnormal state that must disappear once mankind matures?

Upon this issue, which I have formulated in its utmost simplicity, opinions are divided into two general categories. The first category holds that nationalities are merely intermittent, arbitrary stages, through which mankind must

pass from ignorance to reason. The other, studying mankind in the scientific manner, as employed in the natural sciences, shows that nationality and race are natural and constitutive elements of mankind, like species and genera, and therefore absolutely necessary for its development. The first category or division includes the advocates of despotism, for whom everything in the world is chance or luck [...]. For [the advocates of despotism], nationality, like any other thing, is made and unmade by the wish of the masters; [to the advocates of despotism] national feeling is a prejudice, fit for serving, as needed, the ambitions of a man, a family or a class. Tsar Nicholas and the Emperor of Austria share this belief.

If nationalities had only these latter as adversaries, I would not have needed to talk about them; but unfortunately, even in our camp, in the camp of liberty, there have been and there still are people, who, seeing only the negative side of the national feeling, regard nationalities as forms of the past—which could prevent mankind's brotherhood—and an obstacle of progress. [...]

In scientific language, the word 'race' is used to denote the five great divisions of humankind, which are, as I have said, the white or Caucasian race, the yellow or Mongolian race, the red or American one, the black or Ethiopian one, and the Malayan. Race is subdivided into families such as the Latin, German and Slavic families, who are part of the Caucasian race, the rest of whom lives in Asia and Africa. Thus, the words race and family have very clear meanings; despite this, in ordinary language, the word race is used in the sense of family, and I was forced to use this word with this meaning, so as to avoid confusing my readers.

Talking about the formation of races, I touch upon an issue that may seem pointless to some. I have seen people who, though heated partisans of nationality, would not admit that the formation of races could have any sense. How could Romanians, they tell me, be more directly and more intimately related to the Italians, and the French, rather than to the Germans, the Hungarians and the Slavs, who are their neighbors? Far be it from me the idea of hostility between races, no less than that among nations or people. Such enmity was the condition of ignorance, of the past. The solidarity and brotherhood of races, peoples and individuals are the conditions of the future society, in the triumph of which I believe and to the triumph of which I want to contribute with all my power to hasten its onset. I insist, however, on the formation of races, for I believe it is a means of the development of man, another shield for our protection against hostilities and wars that can last among races. I intend, by making them face each other in their entirety, to have them learn

to respect each other and shake hands with each other as equals. Thus, we will give the last blow to the idea of conquest. Emperor Nicholas will not be able to exploit Pan-Slavism any longer, by making the Slavs believe that in their numbers they are meant to conquer the West, when they know that in Europe there are no singular nations, but races more numerous and compact, or even more powerful, than the Slavic race. If a nation is an individuality that has the right to exist by itself, the more so with a race, whose physical, intellectual and moral personality is stronger and more specific. The proof is that in German and Slavic countries the individuals of different nations of the Latin race can be mistaken for each other, and it is only the type of race that counts. Likewise, in France, except for those who have conducted specific studies on the German nations, they cannot tell a Swedish person from a Prussian or a Dutchman; all they see is the German race.

Intimate relations, the exchange of ideas and feelings among nations of the same race are necessary for the development of each one of them, for the effects are more direct than those produced by the relations among nations of different races. In the case of the Romanians, for instance, as long as they were inspired only by the German genius in their studies, Romania was a stranger to progress. When they also studied in Italy, and especially in France, they were able to introduce their nation to civilization. [...]

Races are large individualities, groups of peoples, and like everything that exists in nature, they have their way of being. We must look for that way and take advantage of it. As long as we did not know the physiology of the human genre, we did not know that wonderful classification that science gives us today; now, when we know it, it would be irresponsible to deny or crush it. The more its circle of progress widens, the more man grows. All these divisions and subdivisions of the human race are to its advantage. As in the sciences, by means of classification, we could speculate; from this marvelous classification of the human race, God made for humans a ladder by means of which they can climb to Him. Home, the nation, the generic family and race are the steps of this ladder. Indeed, man receives from his mother's breast the first impression of a moral life; on the lap of the father he gets the first ray that brightens his intelligence, and in the circle of the community he learns to love his fellows. Eventually, the motherland takes him on her wings to show him a horizon which he had not even dreamed of; she makes him feel that in his heart throbs the blood of several million people; he understands solidarity and brotherhood, he is ready to sacrifice himself, and he is consecrated as a citizen. In the heart of nations of the same family his circle of brothers widens, he feels stronger than Samson, life means harmony for

him, everything grows, everything stretches out and floats on the ocean. Race initiates him, more than any other element, in the secrets of general life. Making him perceive the individualities of mankind, [race] shows him that it is a transcendent classification, it teaches him that man is not an anomaly on Earth, but the crown of this harmonious world. Race makes him part of mankind, and mankind—making him understand a moral world besides the physical one—connects him to the infinite, and thus he rises to God, from that moment onwards convinced of his immortality.

Translated by Mária Kovács

MEMORANDUM OF THE SECRET CENTRAL BULGARIAN COMMITTEE

Title: *Принапомнювание (Мемоар), отправено на Н. И. В. Султана от Тайния Централен Български Комитет* (Memorandum to His Imperial Majesty the Sultan from the Secret Central Bulgarian Committee)

Originally published: in the newspaper *Народност* (1867)

Language: Bulgarian

The excerpts used are from *Българско Възраждане. Христоматия по история на България* (Sofia: БАН, 1969), pp. 324–332.

Context

The SCBC (Secret Central Bulgarian Committee), established in Bucharest in 1866, was one of the most important Bulgarian political organizations before the creation of the Bulgarian Revolutionary Central Committee (see **Hristo Botev**, *Hadji Dimiter* and *The hanging of Vasil Levski*). In contrast to the previous period, the most important Bulgarian political organizations after the Crimean war were based in Russia and the Romanian principalities. Those based in Russia—such as the Virtuous Society (or ‘Committee of the Old’), created in 1862, and the Bulgarian Board of Trustees of Odessa, created in 1858—were of pro-Russian orientation and followed Russia’s Balkan policy. Both of them represented the merchant class and cultural elite of the Bulgarian diaspora in Russia. The two organizations proposed different dualist projects. In 1867 the Board of Trustees of Odessa developed a project for a dualist Serbo-Bulgarian (or Bulgaro-Serbian) Kingdom, which was initially accepted by the Serbian government under Russian persuasion but was not implemented in the end. In its turn, the Virtuous Society sent a letter to the Paris conference in 1869 (focusing on the problem of Crete), which formulated a dualist project for the future of the Ottoman Empire, in terms of a Turko-Bulgarian Kingdom. The opposite tendency, advocating a solution to the Bulgarian national question through arms and revolutionary struggle, was

initially championed by Georgi Sava Rakovski (1821–1867), the founder of the organized national-revolutionary movement. He created and led in the 1860s regiments of Bulgarian volunteers in Serbia, which came to be known as the First and Second Bulgarian Legions, with the purpose of undertaking an armed campaign against the Ottoman Empire, thus provoking a general insurrection of the Bulgarians. Shortly before his death he conceived a new plan of liberation involving the creation of a unitary national army under a so-called Supreme Popular Bulgarian Civilian Government in Romania, with the goal of provoking a wholesale uprising of the Bulgarians free of any foreign interference.

The SCBC, which was formed in Romania in 1866 by Rakovski's secretary Ivan Kasabov, held a particular midway position between the revolutionary and the political reformist tendencies characterizing the Bulgarian political organizations. In the beginning, the agenda of the SCBC was to a large extent influenced by the politics of the Romanian government, which, after Prince Alexandru I. Cuza was forced to abdicate, had started to prepare for the attack of the Ottoman army against Romania and counted on the support of a large uprising in Bulgaria. Rakovski was given the task of organizing this military action. Unexpectedly, however, Romanian politics changed (because the new regime was quickly recognized internationally), and the SCBC lost the support of the government. As a result, in 1867, the SCBC changed its tactics radically by proposing to the Sublime Porte a project for the radical reformation of the Ottoman Empire into a new dual monarchy, envisioning the Bulgarian Kingdom as an integrative part of the Empire. Although this text remained without any significant consequence and did not receive any response from Constantinople, it can be considered the most developed dualist political project to emerge during the struggles for an independent Bulgarian state. The main elements of the project—obviously based on the Austro-Hungarian example—dealing with political autonomy are: the setting up of a constitutional government; the creation of a Bulgarian Kingdom under the sovereignty of the Empire; the Emperor as both 'Sultan of the Ottomans' and 'King of the Bulgarians'; a Bulgarian Kingdom governed by a proxy, a Christian to be appointed by the government and endorsed by the Sultan; and, finally, the establishment of Eastern Orthodoxy as the official religion of the Bulgarian Kingdom.

An attentive reading of the Statutes of the Secret Central Bulgarian Committee will note the ambivalent statement in Article 2, postulating that all means are valid as long as the final goal is achieved. In the light of this statement, the dualist project elaborated by the SCBC can be read as one of

the possible ways pondered by its authors for achieving national freedom. This article and the last paragraph of the Memorandum determined the conventional interpretation of the Memorandum as a political bluff. The strongest argument supporting this interpretation is the fact that the successor of the SCBC, the 'Bulgarian Society' (1868–1869), organized the military detachment (*cheta*) of Hadji Dimiter and Stefan Karadja, with the intention to provoke a large-scale military conflict in Bulgaria. The *cheta* crossed the Danube in July 1868 and was subsequently destroyed by the Ottoman army (see **Hristo Botev**, *Hadji Dimiter*). As a matter of fact, after the announcement of the Memorandum, the SCBC had terminated its formal existence. It confined its activity to the publishing of the newspaper *Narodnost* (Nationality). Therefore, mainstream historiography tended to consider the SCBC as a transitory step in the development of the Bulgarian independentist project, which led to the creation of the BRCC.

According to the more recent trends of interpretation, however, the text represents the views of a basically liberally-oriented formation, supported by a broad section of the emigrant community, transcending the 'old' and 'young' divide, that was less dogmatic about the means of solving the national question. That was its strength and its weakness and, as in many similar party-political cases, disputes over politics catalyzed organizational splits. The assumption that it was a 'transitory step' was natural within the logic of the teleological canon of 'national liberation,' postulating the pre-eminence of the revolutionary solution. According to another possible reading, however, the revolutionary option was not at all the obvious one and consequently, its historical success needs to be historicized.

The contemporary debates around dualism did not take the 'Memorandum' into account simply because it preserved its conspiratorial character and reached the broader public only later. In any case, the Memorandum was criticized by the leaders (Dr. Stoyan Chomakov and Ilarion Makariopolski) of the movement for the establishment of an independent church in Constantinople as it was endangering their project of establishing a Bulgarian Exarchate. Similar was the attitude of the moderate Bulgarian press dominated by the elite circles in Constantinople, which championed a reformist project for the Ottoman Empire leading to a dualist Kingdom. In contrast, in the press of the revolutionary wing, based in Romania, dualism emerged as a pejorative *topos* denoting the conservative circles of Constantinople (see **Hristo Botev**, *The People*). Furthermore, it was mainly in the BRCC press organs that dualism became discussed, acquiring negative connotations. For **Botev**, the term "dualist" was synonymous with "traitor of the nation"—he labeled his social

and political enemies as “dualists,” semantically related to the Bulgarian upper class (*‘chorbadji’* and high clericals), whose headquarters were in Constantinople. This did not mean, however, the complete abandonment of the federal discourse. Even if a military uprising was considered by the proponents of a revolutionary solution as the most obvious way to acquire independence, federalism also remained an option. Liuben Karavelov, for instance, was a fervent promoter of the federalist idea: he championed the idea of a confederation of the Danubian states following the example of Switzerland, while **Botev** was advancing the project of a confederation of the Southern Slavs. But the vision of a Bulgarian-Ottoman dual monarchy became increasingly unrealistic as the Bulgarian national movement headed towards its decisive clash with the Empire.

BM

Memorandum
To His Imperial Majesty, Sultan Abdülaziz Khan,
our Merciful Father and Master,
from the Secret Central Bulgarian Committee

Your Majesty!

In the lives of nations times come when silence and endurance become more than pernicious both to them and to their governors, and therefore, worthier of condemnation than the claim of their needs and yearnings.

The destiny of every private person, as well as of every nation in general, is in the hands of the almighty Creator that rules over the universe. This same destiny, four centuries ago, placed us, the Bulgarians, and our dear fatherland, under the rule of the glorious conquerors who founded the Ottoman Empire in Europe. To that time, our ancestors had been accustomed to being always the victors, and it was only the brave conquerors, the sultans Murad, Beyazid Yıldırım [Thunderbolt] and Mohamed II, who managed to defeat them.

Was it a feeling of national pride, or of civil virtue, so deeply rooted in the hearts of our last kings, Ivan Shishman, Georgi Stratimir and Asen IV, that prevented them from asking the powerful sultans for peace and mercy, as the Serb princes and especially the Moldo-Wallachian chieftains did?

We do not wish to rummage the secrets of history for those who have dauntlessly triumphed, and for those who have gloriously fallen; we shall only say that such was the destiny, that Providence had prepared for us.

Even today, God only knows the reasons for the rise and fall of nations; God only knows the future that is preserved both for the most powerful empires, and for the humblest nations.

Nevertheless, it is quite obvious that a new era is being prepared in the East, and one need not open the book of destiny to understand that we are already on the verge of fundamental changes.

In such a critical situation for the Ottoman Empire, and one not less critical for the Bulgarian people as well, it will be more reasonable than anything else for them to voice their true wishes and sufferings to their august Monarch.

As the true body of the Bulgarian nation, the most numerous among those nations which Providence has placed under your rule, we raise our voice on its behalf, believing that this voice will be heard and that its lawful wishes will be fulfilled.

Your Majesty!

The evil we have noted has long ago attracted the attention of the Imperial Government, and already at the time of your august brother and predecessor, the ever-memorable Sultan Abdülmecid, more edicts were issued—the *Hatt-ı erif*, the *Tanzimat*, and the *Hatt-ı hümayün*—by the supreme authority, attempting to correct this harm; but unfortunately, due to the non-execution of some of their provisions and the misinterpretation of others, the cure turned out to be worse than the disease itself, and the situation of the people, instead of improving, became even more toilsome. In order to be convinced of this, one should only cast a glance at the present state of the Empire. Bewail if such measures are still to be taken, for these shall not have ...^{*} happiness and will not in the least satisfy the people.

With this conviction, we dare present to Your Imperial Majesty that which, we believe, is the sole means to overcome the danger that threatens the Empire, and to solve the Eastern problem in favor of the integrity of the Empire and its resuscitation with fresh elements.

In doing this, we act as loyal subjects of the Empire, to which we are bound through four centuries of history. Therefore, we ask Your Imperial Majesty not to condemn this act as intending harm, but to consider even more the wishes of a nation which desires nothing but to give its ruler new evidence of its everlasting loyalty.

^{*} Unreadable parts are marked with ellipses.

Your Majesty!

The requests of the Bulgarian people are to be found in the few words below:

That Your Imperial Majesty strengthen forever the ties that keep us bound to Your throne by proclaiming our political and religious autonomy, based on an independent Constitution. That Your Imperial Majesty add to his title “Sultan of the Ottomans” that of “King of the Bulgarians.” At first glance, these requests may seem contradictory to the politics and the interests of the Empire; however, we dare say that were the Bulgarians allowed to have advocates close to the throne, like those persons who are given audience at present in relation to our ecclesiastical question, the Sublime Porte would have long ago heard the requests we voice today, and great benefits would have been effected both for the Ottoman Empire in general, and for the Bulgarian people in particular.

Let it now be allowed us to present to Your Imperial Majesty the foundations upon which the Bulgarian people wishes and requests its autonomy to be proclaimed.

Concerning political autonomy

Article 1. There shall be a constitutional government of the people.

Article 2. Bulgaria, together with all its provinces with a Bulgarian population, shall be identified as, and called, “the Bulgarian Kingdom.”

Article 3. The said Bulgarian Kingdom shall politically depend on the Ottoman Empire and shall always have, as its King, the Emperor of the Supreme Devlet¹ of Istanbul, His Imperial Majesty Sultan Abdülaziz and his successors, who shall add to their title of “Sultan of the Ottomans” the title “King of the Bulgarians.”

Article 4. His Imperial Majesty the Sultan shall always be crowned as King of the Bulgarians in one of the old capitals of the Bulgarian Kingdom, which shall be determined by the National Assembly.

Article 5. The Kingdom shall be governed by a King’s Proxy, a Christian to be appointed by the people’s government and recognized by the Sultan.

¹ *Tr.*, State, country.

Article 6. The King's Proxy shall be, after His Majesty the Sultan, head of the state, the government and the executive power, commander-in-chief of the Bulgarian army and executive of justice.

Article 7. The King's Proxy shall rule the Kingdom with the help of a council, whose members shall be exclusively Bulgarian and shall be elected by the National Assembly. The members of the council shall share power among themselves, each of them being head of one section; they shall have the right to initiate the preparation of projects of laws and the drafting of the state budget, which drafts, after having been approved by the National Assembly, shall be submitted for the supreme authorization of the King's Proxy; they shall be mutually responsible for their acts, and therefore, no resolution of the King's proxy shall come into effect unless it has been endorsed by the council members.

Article 8. The National Assembly shall be composed of a fixed number of members representing all the populations of Bulgaria. These shall be elected by the people on the basis of a majority of votes, in compliance with a special law, without the least interference on the part of the government.

Article 9. Eastern Orthodoxy shall be the dominant religion in the country.

Article 10. Justice shall be conducted under the special Bulgarian laws that will be adopted by the Assembly.

It will be separated from, and independent of, the administrative part. Courts shall rule in the name of the law and the King's Proxy. In the capital of the kingdom there shall be a Supreme Court of Justice, which shall review, approve or invalidate the verdicts of the courts.

Article 11. The Bulgarian Kingdom shall have a people's army of its own, independent and organized according to the new systems, and in compliance with a special law.

The commanders of the army, as well as its priests, shall be Bulgarian. The army uniform shall be the national military costume. Its flags shall have the imperial coat of arms on one side, and the Lion, which is the emblem of Bulgaria, on the other. It shall participate together with the imperial army in every operation that has to do with the defense of our shared homeland; its operations shall be restricted to Europe only.

Article 12. An obligation shall be fixed which the Bulgarian Kingdom shall pay to the Empire on an annual basis, and which shall be provided for every year in the Kingdom's budget.

Article 13. The Bulgarian language shall be the official language of the Kingdom.

Article 14. Every civil and political freedom shall be granted, for example, freedom of the press, of speech, of meetings, of public discussions on political and public issues and so forth, as well as personal freedom, the inviolability of private property and religious tolerance.

Article 15. Town and village municipalities shall have their own councils in order to administer local issues, independently from the state administration and in compliance with a special law.

Concerning the Bulgarian Church

Article 1. The Bulgarian Church shall be re-established according to the way it used to exist in the past, i.e., autonomous and independent from any other Church, and shall bear the name 'Bulgarian Orthodox Church.'

Your Majesty!

Above every other step, the Bulgarians, by submitting this Memorandum to Your Imperial Majesty, perform one of their greatest duties. But if, unfortunately, their wishes are left unanswered, the grave responsibility for the consequences, which might follow, will be on those who condemn the lawful requests of an entire nation, loyal and obedient.

This act of ours is not inspired by any kind of foreign influence. This Memorandum, written among Bulgarians and by themselves, expresses their true wishes.

As traditionally loyal subjects of Your Imperial Majesty and as true representatives of the Bulgarian people, in the name of four centuries of suffering, in the name of the spirit of the Enlightenment and justice of the nineteenth century, for the fame and glory of Your Imperial Majesty, for the salvation and grandeur of the Ottoman Empire, we request fulfillment of the wishes of the Bulgarian people, so that we may all exclaim as one: Long live His Imperial Majesty Abdülaziz Khan, Sultan of the Ottomans, King of the Bulgarians!

1867

The Secret Central Bulgarian Committee

The Statutes of the Secret Central Bulgarian Committee

[...] Article 2. Their [i.e. the Secret Central Bulgarian Committee's] principles and aim are the liberation of their Fatherland, in whatever ways and with whatever means—i.e. through the reestablishment of an independent Bulgarian Kingdom; through the reestablishment of an autonomous Bulgarian Kingdom under the Porte; or through confederation (union) with neighboring nations.

Translated by Elena Alexieva

DOSITEJ OBRADOVIĆ: RISE, O SERBIA

Title: *Vostani Serbie* (Rise, O Serbia)

Originally published: Venice, Pane Theodosios, 1804

Language: Slaveno-Serbian

Reprinted in Dositej Obradović, *Sabrana dela*, vol. III (Belgrade: Prosveta, 1961), pp. 17–19.

About the author

Dositej Obradović [ca.1740, Čakovo (Banat), (*Rom.* Ciacova, present-day Romania) – 1811 Belgrade]: Orthodox monk, writer, teacher, and politician. He was born Dimitrije Obradović, but was renamed Dositej in 1757 when he became a monk. In his early childhood his parents died and he was raised by a foster family. In 1760, with the blessing of his abbot, he left the monastery to pursue his education. He went to Zagreb to study Latin and became a teacher in Dalmatia. Soon after, he traveled to Greece, Asia Minor, Italy, Germany, France, England, and Russia. During these travels he learned Greek, German, English, Italian, and French, and enriched his knowledge in the fields of philosophy, the natural sciences and literature. In 1782 he left his monastic order and enrolled at the University of Halle, where he was strongly encouraged to write and publish his own works. In the 1780s and 1790s he wrote a series of works popularizing the philosophical ideas of the Enlightenment, especially in the form of moral tales and parables. During the First Serbian Uprising he gave both financial and moral support to the leaders of the movement. In 1806 he left Trieste and went to Serbia to offer concrete help in building new institutions. He was one of the founders of the first Serbian high school, the *Velika škola* in Belgrade. Moreover, he became responsible for education in the government of Serbian insurgents and was in charge of the education of the son of **Karađorđe**, the leader of the Uprising. Dositej is considered the most prominent figure of the Enlightenment in Serbia. His works were mostly free adaptations of foreign texts ('Advices of sound reason,' 'Fables,' and others). In terms of genre his works are heterogeneous, including anecdotes, moralistic essays, philosophical treatises, fables (Obradović's favorite form), occasional verses, and even a drama. He also had a considerable impact on Bulgarian and Romanian culture at the turn of the nineteenth century. He has been praised as the first rationalist and modern thinker among the Serbs and a radical champion and propagator of the ideas of the Enlightenment in Southeast Europe.

Main works: *Život i priključenja Dimitrija Obradovića narečenog u kaluđerstvu Dositeja* [Life and adventures of Dimitrije Obradović, in his monastic name Dositej] (1783); *Sovjeti zdravago razuma* [Advices of sound reason] (1784); *Sobranje raznih naravoučiteljih vešćej* [Collection of various moral writings]; *Pismo Haralampiju* [Letter to Haralampije] (1783); *Basne* (Fables) (1788).

Context

The First Serbian Uprising (1804–1813) (see **Đorđe Petrović (Karađorđe)**, *Letter to Petar Petrović Njegoš*) had broken out in defense of the lost rights to administrative self-rule and securing order that had been granted by the central Ottoman authority to the Belgrade Pashalik in the late-eighteenth century but which had been swept away by the reign of terror of the *dahiye*.¹ The impetus, ideological as well as material, for the gradual transformation of the revolt into what later became generally distinguished as a ‘national revolution,’ came to a very large extent from the Serbian diaspora in the Habsburg domains. The far more auspicious political and infrastructural environment from which the Habsburg Serbs profited, especially in the neighboring region of Vojvodina, spurred the movement for the cultural ‘revival’ and national emancipation of the Serbs in Serbia proper.

The ideas regarding political liberation and a modern national state as well as the bureaucratic personnel for the newly established Serbian principality after 1830 also emerged from the Habsburg areas. The cultural-political heritage of Dositej Obradović can be seen as epitomizing these tendencies. At the moment when the First Uprising started, Dositej was in Trieste. He received the news about its outbreak with enthusiasm, and was engaged in active correspondence with its leaders and prominent Serbs in Austria, with whom he tried to organize help for the rebels. Although Dositej was later accused by his famous contemporaries, **Vuk Karadžić** and **Njegoš**, of professing double moral standards, his actions bear witness to his strong devotion to the idea of a liberated Serbia. He donated half of his savings to the Serbian fighters, and offered effective recommendations about the direction which Serbia should take in the event of success in the struggle.

In a letter from 1805 Dositej warned the rebels not to trust Austria, and expressed his concern for the survival of the Serbian nation due to its smallness. He claims that the most important values for any state are security and peace, but recommends a more callous treatment of the *dahiye* and the Turks. In the

¹ Local Turkish commanders of the Belgrade Pashalik engaged in banditry.

same letter he gave some advice as to the establishment of a new social and political order in liberated Serbia, concentrating on reforms in the military, legal, financial, juridical areas. In his appeal for recognizing Karađorđe as the central figure of the new regime, his bent is towards a strong centralized authority, although with a clear modernizing character, and support for a strong leader can be detected. In this respect, he was most probably influenced by the theoretical considerations of 'enlightened absolutism' and the actual threat of secession by local *voivodes* (military leaders) undermining the envisioned unitary state. Dositej's support for the 'uprising' and its leaders was strongly emotional as well. He dedicated a poem to Karađorđe and the insurgents, entitled 'A poem for the Insurrection of the Serbs' (*Pjesna na insurekciju Srbijanov*) and included it in one of his letters to the Supreme Commander of the insurgent army and his military associates. Later, it became known by its first verses: "Rise, O Serbia!" In Dositej's song, Serbia is pictured as a 'sleeping Beauty', asleep for centuries. The verses call upon her to wake up and give an example to her 'sisters', Bosnia, Herzegovina and Montenegro.

While, in general, Obradović's intellectual formation places him into the category of late Enlightenment, this poem features a number of *topoi* which can be considered precursors of the Romantic cultural-political discourse. Most importantly, the motif of 'awakening', of national revival, has become crucial for the next generations. In the twentieth century, the poem has been canonized, and it is still sung at solemn national celebrations, serving as an unofficial anthem.

IE

A poem for the insurrection of the Serbs

Dedicated to Serbia and to its brave knights and children and to their Duke
by the will of God, Mr. Đorđe Petrović

Rise, O Serbia! Rise, O empress!
And let your children see your face.
Turn their hearts and eyes unto you,
And let them hear your sweet voice.
Rise, O Serbia!
You fell asleep long ago,
You lay in darkness.
Wake up now
And stir up the Serbs!

You raise your imperial head up,
Let the earth and the sea know you again.
Show Europe your beautiful face,
Bright and cheerful like the appearance of Venus.
Rise, O Serbia!
You fell asleep long ago,
You lay in darkness.
Wake up now
And stir up the Serbs!

Remember, O our mother, your first glory,
Shame the heads of your enemies!
Expel the wild janissary from Vračar²
Who now does not obey his very emperor!
Rise, O Serbia!
You fell asleep long ago,
You lay in darkness.
Wake up now
And stir up the Serbs!

You are now aided by heaven's will
And are now facing a better destiny.
All your neighbors wish you well
And remote nations rejoice at your well-being.
Rise, O Serbia!
You fell asleep long ago,
You lay in darkness.
Wake up now
And stir up the Serbs!

Rise, O Serbia! Rise, O our dear mother!
And become once more what you used to be.
The sincere Serbian children,
Who are fighting for you now call for you.
Rise, O Serbia!
You fell asleep long ago,
You lay in darkness.

² District of Belgrade.

Wake up now
And stir up the Serbs!

Bosnia, your sister, looks at you
And wishes you no harm.
He who hates you, fears not God.
From whom many an aid descends unto you.
Rise, O Serbia!
You fell asleep long ago,
You lay in darkness.
Wake up now
And stir up the Serbs!

Herzegovina and Montenegro,
Faraway countries and islands in the sea,
All of them wish you heavenly assistance,
All good souls rejoice at you,
And say in unison:
Rise, O Serbia!
You fell asleep long ago,
You lay in darkness.
Wake up now
And stir up the Serbs!

Translated by Vedran Dronjić

ALEXANDROS YPSILANTIS: FIGHT FOR FAITH AND MOTHERLAND!

Title: *Μάχου ὑπὲρ πίστεως καὶ πατρίδος* (Fight for Faith and Motherland!)

Originally published: as a leaflet in Iași, 24 February 1822.

Language: Greek

The excerpts text used are from: Apostolos Daskalakis, *Κείμενα-πηγαί τῆς ἱστορίας τῆς ἐλληνικῆς ἐπαναστάσεως* (Αθήνα: 1966), pp. 141–144.

About the author

Alexandros Ypsilantis [1792, Bucharest – 1828, St. Petersburg]: military leader. He was the offspring of one of the most distinguished Phanariot families. His grandfather Alexandros and his father Constantinos had been appointed by the Ottoman authorities as princes of the Danubian Principalities. The Sultan, however, was persuaded by the accusations of Napoleon's ambassador Sebastiani that Constantinos was pro-Russian and dismissed him in 1805. Thereupon the family fled to Russia. The young Alexandros joined the Russian army and fought during the Napoleonic wars. After the battle of Dresden in 1813, where he lost his right hand, he was promoted to the rank of colonel, and in 1817 he became major-general. In 1820 he was approached by Emmanouil Xanthos, one of the leaders of the *Philiki Etairia* (Friendly Society), and agreed to join the secret society. Very soon he was given the title of 'General Commissioner.' In February 1821 Ypsilantis crossed the River Prut to Moldavia, thus raising the signal for an uprising. However, his troops were soon crushed by the Ottoman army at Drăgășani in Wallachia. Ypsilantis then crossed the border into Austria, where he was immediately arrested and imprisoned. He was released in 1827, thanks to an appeal by the Tsar. Alexandros Ypsilantis demonstrated a flamboyant and enthusiastic patriotism, which, however, was not accompanied by military genius. His limited abilities caused his comrades to lose faith in him and eventually to abandon him. However, he was the first to give the signal for the Greek uprising which resulted in the creation of the modern Hellenic state. Consequently, Greek historiography has treated him as a national hero.

Context

The Napoleonic wars (1797–1814) proved profitable for Greek-Orthodox artisans, seamen and merchants who had settled in southeast Russia and the Danubian Principalities. The continental blockade imposed by the British offered to courageous entrepreneurs ample opportunities to be involved in smuggling. However, Napoleon's defeat put an end to these favorable circumstances and drove these groups into bankruptcy. It was under these social and economic conditions that in 1814 in Odessa three bankrupt merchants—Nikolaos Skoufas, Andreas Tsakalof and Emmanouil Xanthos—founded the *Philiki Etairia*. The three merchants, like many others, found themselves in an awkward position. They were members of a bourgeois stratum which no longer found it sufficient to entrust intellectuals such as **Korais** or **Rigas** with the task of enlightening their compatriots in the areas under Ottoman rule. Influenced by French revolutionary ideas, they decided to become more active in order to liberate their motherland from the Ottoman 'yoke' and create a nation-state conforming to their aspirations.

The *Philikoi*, as the members of the Society called themselves, managed to extend their network. They were all bound under oath to fight for the liberation of the motherland. In fact, as was the case with many revolutionary secret societies, the *Philiki Etairia* was also organized on a Masonic pattern. As soon as the uprising broke out, these networks proved very useful. However, the uprising also meant the end of the *Philiki Etairia*, since leadership was taken over by the military and the notables of the Morea (Peloponnese) and Rumelia. Nevertheless, on the eve of the uprising, the movement needed a prominent leader who could inspire faith in victory. Count Capodistrias, the foreign minister of the Tsar who was initially offered the leadership, suggested that Alexandros Ypsilantis should be the person. Thus, in October 1820 Ypsilantis, together with many among the leading figures of the *Etairia*, gathered at Ismail (*Rus.* Izmayil, in Bessarabia). According to the initial plan, Ypsilantis was to travel to Trieste and from there on to the Morea, where he would give the signal for the uprising. However, an uprising in the Principalities was considered more appropriate, on the grounds that Serbs and Bulgarians might also join in.

On 6 March 1821 Ypsilantis, dressed as a Russian general, crossed the Prut river together with twenty comrades. When he arrived in Iași, he reassured Prince Mikhail Soutzos (*Rom.* Șuțu), a fervent supporter of the revolutionaries, that 70,000 Russians would soon follow. The boyars of Iași, encouraged by Soutzos, contributed funds for the creation of an army. How-

ever, when on 13 March Ypsilantis marched to Bucharest, his army numbered less than 2,000, the core of which was formed by the *Ιερός Λόχος* (Sacred Band), a special corps formed by students. In the meantime, Tudor Vladimirescu, a prominent military leader in Wallachia and a crucial prospective ally of Ypsilantis, had addressed to his compatriots a proclamation asking them to fight against the injustice of the boyars and clergymen. However, under the pressure of *Philiki Etairia* he soon issued a new proclamation encouraging the population to obey the boyars and pay their taxes. The peasants were disappointed. They had no reason to fight for the Greeks who had been ruling them for more than a century, nor for the boyars who had joined the Greeks. They began abandoning Tudor, who, they claimed, had not kept his promise of supporting a popular uprising. Eventually, instead of a joint military campaign, the Romanian troops turned against the Greeks. Tudor was arrested by Ypsilantis and sentenced to death. The Ottoman troops had already entered the Principalities and started hunting down the rebels. On 18 June, at Drăgășani, the volunteers of the 'Sacred Band' were massacred.

An important aspect of these events was Ypsilantis' failure to secure support. His appeals to the Tsar remained unanswered. Instead, the Tsar, when informed about the revolt, urged Capodistrias to write a letter repudiating Ypsilantis. To make things worse, Patriarch Gregorios V pronounced an anathema against all rebels. It has been suggested that this anathema was a tactical move on the part of the Patriarch in order to save the Greek-Orthodox population of Constantinople (Istanbul) from retaliation. Yet he was able to save neither them nor himself.

In the proclamation, entitled 'Fight for Faith and Motherland!', that Ypsilantis issued when he crossed the Prut, he appealed to all male 'Hellenes' (referring to the Hellenized population of the Balkans, transcending ethnic differences) to join the uprising. He reassured them that the enlightened nations of Europe would support them in the fight against the barbaric tyrants. Moreover, he claimed that the Hellenes would prove themselves worthy of the glory of their ancestors only if they embarked on a heroic struggle "in the name of faith and motherland." The proclamation made it clear that the uprising would seek to liberate "the Ionian and Aegean coasts," thus making practically no reference to the local population. Instead, he addressed the "Serbs and the Souliots"¹ on equal terms, demonstrating his belief that only Hellenes formed a concrete nation in the region, whereas the rest were nothing more than ethnic groups with a local identity. Finally, he

¹ The inhabitants of Souli, a complex of villages on the mountains of Epirus.

stressed that a 'Great Power' was going to support the movement, clearly referring to Russia. However, both the enthusiasm and the self-confidence of the text attest more to the self-sacrificing patriotism of the members of *Philiki Etairia* than to any strong political affiliations or military preparations.

As a matter of fact, the events of 1821 did put an end to Phanariot rule in the Principalities. In 1822 Grigore IV Ghica was appointed Prince of Wallachia and Ion Sturdza Prince of Moldavia. However, Ypsilantis' activity gave the signal to the southern part of the Balkans, where in mid-March 1821 in Kalamata, Patras and Tripoli, the Ottoman garrisons as well as the local Muslim population were slaughtered. The warfare ceased only with the acceptance on the part of the Ottomans of an independent Hellenic state in 1829, ratified by the Treaty of Adrianople (*Tur.* Edirne), after a Russian-Ottoman war. In the end, the support from the 'Great Power' which Ypsilantis promised did help the Greeks to achieve their freedom, albeit belatedly.

The proclamation 'Fight for Faith and Motherland!' is considered as one of the fundamental documents of the Greek War of Independence and has been included in all collections on the subject. Equally, Greek nationalist historiography has treated the *Philiki Etairia* as the driving force which led to the liberation of the nation. Interestingly, however, both the social preconditions of its appearance and also its failure to inspire solidarity among the local population have been downplayed in the relevant narratives. Instead, the massacre of the Sacred Band has been presented only as an act of self-sacrifice and has been accorded a prominent place in the pantheon of the War of Independence. Moreover, the mythical dimensions of the secret character of the *Philiki Etairia* resulted in its use as a symbol of revolutionary activity to describe a number of similar movements, from the nationalist activities of the *Society of Constantinople* in 1908–12 (see **Georgios Boussios**, *The political program of Hellenism in Turkey*) to the resistance movement during WWII.

VK

Fight for Faith and Motherland!

The time has come, O Hellenes! Our brothers and friends are everywhere ready. The Serbs, the Souliots and the whole of Epirus are armed and await us. Let us join together then with enthusiasm! Our Motherland is calling us!

Europe, its eyes fixed upon us, wonders at our inertia. So let all the mountains of Greece echo with the sound of our battle trumpet, and the valleys with the fearful clang of our weapons. Europe will admire our valor, while our tyrants,

shaking and pale, will flee before us. The enlightened peoples of Europe are occupied with enjoying their prosperity and, filled with gratitude for the benefactions bestowed upon them by our forefathers, desire the liberation of Greece.

If we show ourselves worthy of our ancestral virtue and of the present century, we are hopeful of achieving our own defense and that many of these who are freedom-lovers will come to fight with us. Make the move, O friends, and you will see a mighty power defending our rights! You will see many among our enemies who, moved by our just cause, will turn their backs on the enemy and unite with us; let them declare themselves sincerely, and the Motherland will embrace them! Who, then, is hindering your manly arms? Our cowardly enemy is ailing and weak. Our generals are experienced, and all our fellow-countrymen are filled with enthusiasm! Unite, then, O brave and magnanimous Hellenes! Let national phalanxes be formed, let patriotic legions appear, and you will see those old giants of despotism falling by themselves before our triumphant banners. All the shores of the Ionian and Aegean seas will echo; the Greek ships, which in times of peace knew both how to trade and to fight, will sow horror and death, by fire and by sword, in all the harbors of the tyrant.

What Hellenic soul will be indifferent to the appeal of the Motherland? In Rome, a friend of Caesar's, waving the bloody mantle of the tyrant, roused the people. What will you do, O Hellenes, to whom the Motherland, naked, shows her wounds, and with broken voice implores the help of her children? Divine Providence, O friends and fellow-countrymen, having taken pity on our misfortunes, has looked favorably upon our circumstances, so that with little effort we will enjoy all manner of happiness with freedom. If, therefore, out of culpable stupidity we are indifferent, the tyrant, becoming more savage, will multiply our sufferings, and we will become forever the most unfortunate of all nations.

Turn your eyes, O fellow-countrymen, and behold our wretched state! See here the violated churches! There, our children seized for the shameless hedonism of our barbarous tyrants! Our houses stripped bare, our fields plundered and ourselves wretched slaves!

It is time to throw off this insufferable yoke, to liberate the Motherland, to topple the crescent from the clouds, so as to raise the symbol by which we are always victorious, I mean the Cross, and thus avenge the Motherland and our Orthodox Faith for the impious scorn of the heathens.

Among ourselves, the noblest is he who bravely defends the rights of the Motherland and who works for it in a beneficial way. The nation assembled will elect its elders and to this highest parliament all our acts shall yield.

Let us move, then, with one common spirit. Let the wealthy give up part of their own fortune, let the holy shepherds encourage the people with their own example, and let the educated advise what is beneficial. Those fellow-countrymen serving as officers and politicians in foreign courts, giving thanks to the power each one serves, let them rush to the brilliant stage which has already opened up and let them contribute to the Motherland the debt they owe; and as brave men let us arm ourselves, without wasting time, with the unconquerable weapon of bravery, and I promise you in a short time victory, and, following that, everything that is good. What paid and flaccid slaves dare stand up against a people fighting for its independence? The heroic struggles of our forefathers are witnesses. Spain, the first and only one to rout the invincible phalanxes of the tyrant, is a witness.²

With unity, O fellow citizens, with respect for our holy religion, with obedience to the laws and our generals, with boldness and steadfastness, our victory is certain and inevitable, and will crown with evergreen laurels our heroic struggles; will carve, with indelible characters, our names on the temple of immortality, for the example of future generations. The Motherland will reward her obedient and true children with the prizes of glory and honor, while those who disobey and turn a deaf ear to this present appeal she will disown as bastards and Asiatic seeds and will give over their names, as those of other traitors, to the anathema and curses of our descendants.

Let us then once again, O brave and magnanimous Hellenes, invite liberty to the classical land of Greece! Let us hold a battle between Marathon and Thermopylae!³ Let us fight on the tombs of our fathers, who, in order to keep us free, fought and died there! The blood of the tyrants is acceptable to the shades of Epameinondas the Theban and Thrasybulus the Athenian, who routed the thirty tyrants⁴; to the shades of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, who crushed the yoke of Peisistratus⁵; to that of Timoleon, who restored liberty in Corinth and Syracuse; and all the more so to those of Miltiades and Themis-

² Reference to the Spanish War of Independence (1808–1814).

³ The sites of battles between the ancient Greeks and the Persians, in 480 and 490 BC respectively.

⁴ The regime of the Thirty Tyrants was imposed on Athens after its defeat by Sparta in the Peloponnesian war (431–404 B.C.).

⁵ Peisistratus (600–527 BC) was an Athenian general who, having achieved distinction in the war against the Megarians (570–565 BC), seized power five years later and ruled as tyrant for 33 years. He was succeeded by his two sons, Hippias and Hipparchus. The second was later assassinated by Harmodius and Aristogeiton.

tocles,⁶ of Leonidas⁷ and his three hundred men, who cut down innumerable times the countless armies of the barbarian Persians, whose most barbarous and cowardly descendants we stand poised today with very little effort to annihilate completely.

To arms, then, friends, the Motherland calls us!

24 February 1821

In the general camp at Iași.

Alexandros Ypsilantis

Translated by Mary Kitroeff

⁶ Athenian generals who defeated the Persians, the first at Marathon, the second in Salamis.

⁷ Spartan king who died heroically with his troops in the battle of Thermopylae.

DIONYSIOS SOLOMOS: HYMN TO LIBERTY

Title: *Ὕμνος εἰς τὴν Ἐλευθερίαν* (Hymn to Liberty)

Originally published: In the appendix to the second volume of Claude Fauriel's *Chants populaires de la Grèce Moderne* (Paris: Didot, 1825). In the same year another version was published in Messolongi, together with an Italian translation.

Language: Greek

The modern critical edition is Dionysios Solomos, *Ἄπαντα*, v. 1. *Ποιήματα* (Athens: Ικαρος, 1979), p. 71.

About the author

Dionysios Solomos [1798, Zante (Gr. Zakynthos) – 1857, Corfu (Gr. Kerkyra)]: poet. He was the son of Count Nikolaos Solomos, a member of the local Greek-Orthodox nobility on Zante, though his family originally came from Crete. After his father's death in 1807, young Dionysios, accompanied by his teacher, left for Italy where he continued his studies in Cremona and Pavia. He wrote poems, winning the admiration of his classmates and teachers. He was influenced by Ugo Foscolo and an even greater imprint on his works seems to come from his encounter with Alessandro Manzoni. It was a period when romantic ideas about nation and the 'people' dominated intellectual life in Lombardy. After moving to Zante in 1818, he wrote his first poems in Italian, following the purist academic Italian tradition. The political controversies of the time, though, soon attracted his attention. He developed an interest in popular songs, and the 'people' soon became the main theme in his poetry. In the meantime, he began writing in the vernacular. This was partly a consequence of the Greek uprising, which had shaken him deeply. In 1825 he composed the 'Hymn to Liberty.' The following year, inspired by the resistance and the heroic exodus of the fighters besieged by the Egyptian troops in Messolongi, he composed *Ελεύθεροι Πολιορκημένοι* (The free besieged). In 1828, due to family controversies, Solomos moved to Corfu, where he grew increasingly reclusive. It was during his period in Corfu that he became familiar with German literature, especially with Schiller's work, in which he discovered the embodiment of his own reflections. In consequence, his poetry turned more esoteric towards the end of his life. After his death, his student Iakovos Polyas published his existing works in *Τὰ Εὕρισκόμενα* (Known works), a seminal critical edition which largely determined Solomos' later reception.

Main works: *Ὕμνος εἰς τὴν Ἐλευθερίαν* [Hymn to Liberty] (1825); *Εἰς τὸ θάνατον τοῦ Λόρδου Μπάϊρον* [On the death of Lord Byron] (1825); *Ἐλεύθεροι Πολιορκημένοι* [The free besieged] (1828–1851, published after his death); *Λάμπρος* [Lambros] (begun in 1826 but never completed); *Ἡ Γυναίκα τῆς Ζάκυνθος* [The Woman of Zante] (1828).

Context

Upon the annexation of the Ionian Islands—the complex of seven islands close to the west coast of today’s mainland Greece—by the French Republic in 1799, the feudal system there was abolished; the ‘*libro d’oro*’ (the golden book), where the family trees of the nobility were listed, was burnt; and the ‘*popolari*,’ the bourgeois groups which had fought against the nobility, came to power. In 1803 the new constitution clearly defined its aim to terminate feudalism and to organize a political system based on limited and oligarchic authority. Eventually, after the Congress of Vienna, the Ionian Islands came under British protection, which brought a certain degree of stability and balance. However, during the Greek War of Independence the British colonial regime became repressive, preventing the indigenous population from providing any help to the rebels.

During the colonial regime, intellectual and cultural life in the Ionian Islands reflected Western developments. Indicative of this intellectual climate had been the foundation, in 1824, of the ‘Ionian Academy,’ the life-work of a romantic British noble, Frederick North, count of Guilford. Guilford promoted the Greek vernacular as the teaching language, thus trying to avoid a gap between academic and popular language similar to the one created at the University of Athens (founded in 1837). In fact, the vernacular had been continuously in use, not only in poetry—where it reached its heyday with Solomos—but also in intellectual debates.

The annexation of the Ionian Islands by Greece, in 1864, sounded a slow deathknell both for the intellectual vitality and the language of its inhabitants, who regarded the social and intellectual environment of the new capital as parochial and bombastic. Solomos himself never visited Athens, fearing that the new capital would disappoint him. The pressure exerted by the center and the hellenocentric discourse of *Ἐνωσις* (Unification), as expressed by figures such as the poet-politician Aristotelis Valaoritis, gradually suppressed all regional specificity. However, despite the undeniable victory of ‘archaic’ Athens over ‘idealistic’ Corfu, the intellectual heritage of the latter remained to inspire Greek intellectuals at the turn of the twentieth century.

This is the ideological and intellectual context in which two poets, both coming from Zante, Andreas Kalvos and Dionysios Solomos, produced their work. These two prominent figures would incorporate in their work the tradition of the vernacular which had been developed outside the Ionian Islands, and especially in the Danubian Principalities. The first work composed in support of the vernacular was *Ρομέικη Γλώσσα* (Romaic language), published in Corfu in 1814 by Ioannis Vilaras, a doctor at the court of Ali Pasha of Tepelen in Jannina. Vilaras for the first time not only fully adopted the vernacular, but also introduced a phonetic alphabet, whereby for each sound only one letter was employed. The two romantic poets from the Ionian Islands followed in his steps, each in his own way. Kalvos (1792–1869) spent most of his life in Europe, mainly in Britain, where he worked as a translator and teacher, in Florence, where he was Ugo Foscolo's secretary, and in Paris; he achieved fame for his *Ωδές* (Odes), written between 1824 and 1826. The poems were accompanied by a French translation so that they could propagate abroad the struggle of the Greek nation. The themes he used were exactly those that had captured the imagination of European public opinion: **Alexandros Ypsilantis'** 'Sacred Band', the Ottoman massacres on Chios in 1822, and so on. Kalvos felt it was his duty to devote his poetry to his nation's revolt. However, his education as a classicist drove him to express his feelings through mythological images.

In his turn, Solomos developed the use of the vernacular while focusing on themes from the Greek War of Independence. Published during the war, the dominant themes of his 'Hymn to Liberty' were his love for the motherland, belief in its liberation and the elimination of tyranny. The poem became immediately known and gained the young poet public esteem. Translations into Italian were repeatedly produced during the Italian Risorgimento in the 1850s and 1860s, since the Greek War of Independence stood as an inspiration for the Italian patriots. In 1864, the year that the Ionian Islands were annexed by Greece, the two first stanzas of the 'Hymn to Liberty' were put to music by Nikolaos Mantzaros, another native son of the Ionian Islands, and were used from then onwards as the national anthem.

However, Solomos' poetry was not favorably received by the purist intellectuals in Athens. Poets like Alexandros Soutsos and Alexandros Rizos Rangavis, who originated from Phanariot circles, rejected the use of the demotic. Rangavis went so far as to call Solomos' language an "idiom of decadence." The universal ideals that Solomos had expressed in his work were not compatible with purist poetry. Among the works which have contributed to the reassessment of his poetry in the twentieth century, the most significant are

considered to be *Σολωμός χωρίς μεταφυσική* (Solomos without metaphysics), written in 1925 by the noted Marxist intellectual and poet Kostas Varnalis, who took a critical stance towards the poet; and later on *Γύρω από τὸ Σολωμό* (On Solomos), written in 1958 by Linos Politis, one of the most prominent Greek historians of literature. A very interesting example of Solomos' recent appropriation by a leftist intellectual discourse is Theo Angelopoulos's movie *Eternity and a Day*, released in 1999.

VK

Hymn to Liberty

We knew thee of old
Oh, divinely restored,
By the light of thine eyes
And the light of thy Sword

From the graves of our slain
Shall thy valour prevail
As we greet thee again-
Hail, Liberty! Hail!

Long time didst thou dwell
Mid the peoples that mourn,
Awaiting some voice
That should bid thee return.

Ah, slow broke the day
And no man dared call,
For the shadow of tyranny
Lay over all:

And we saw thee sad eyed,
The tears on thy cheeks
While thy raiment was dyed
In the blood of the Greeks.

Yet, behold now thy sons
With impetuous breath

Go forth to the fight
Seeking freedom or Death.

From the graves of our slain
Shall thy valour prevail
As we greet thee again-
Hail, Liberty! Hail!

**Translated by Rudyard Kipling, published in *Daily Telegraph*
(17 October 1918).**

ADAM MICKIEWICZ: “PROPHECIES”

Title: *Litania pielgrzymka* (Pilgrim’s litany), in *Księgi narodu polskiego i pielgrzymstwa polskiego* (Books of the Polish nation and pilgrimage); and *Dziady, część trzecia* (The Forefathers, part 3)

Originally published: *Księgi narodu polskiego* in the form of a prayer-book was published in Paris, 1832; the French translation appeared in 1833. *Dziady* was written in Dresden in 1832 and published in Paris the same year in the 4th volume of Mickiewicz’s *Poezje*.

Language: Polish

Modern Polish editions: *Księgi narodu i pielgrzymstwa polskiego*, ed. Stanisław Pigoń (Cracow: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1926); *Dziady: część 3* (Warszawa: PIW, 1995). English editions: *Poems by Adam Mickiewicz*, edited by George Rapall Noyes (New York: Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, 1944), pp. 414–415 and 291–294; Adam Mickiewicz, *The Great Improvisation*, translated by Louise Varèse (New York: Voyages, 1956).

About the author

See: Adam Mickiewicz, *Pan Tadeusz*, pp. 211–212.

Context

In their works on ‘native’ themes, either political and philosophical treatises or literary works, Polish émigrés often referred to the world of politics, situating the Polish case within the framework of a universal struggle for freedom. Thus, Polish romantic literature in many ways functioned as the meta-political manifesto of a democratic ideology. The following works by Mickiewicz represent a literary reaction to the failure of the November Uprising (1830–1831) and the loss of autonomy of the Congress Kingdom. *Księgi narodu i pielgrzymstwa polskiego* opened a new phase in the evolution of Mickiewicz’s ideology. The text gained fame as the most notable ex-

pression of Polish romantic messianism: the idea of Poland as a 'Christ of nations.' *Księgi...* was intentionally phrased as a 'national Gospel' and also played the role of a 'national catechism.' In December 1832 it was published twice in France, and several months later it was also published in Galicia in an underground edition.

Księgi... can also be read as Mickiewicz's reaction to the political conflicts between the various groups of Polish émigrés. The poet supported neither the conservative faction of Hôtel Lambert, led by Adam Jerzy Czartoryski, nor the radical Polish Democratic Society, who were preparing a social revolution and appealing to the broader masses of townspeople and peasants (see **Henryk Kamiński**, *Vital truths of the Polish nation*). In contrast to their strictly political programs, he formulated a transcendental vision, underpinned by a democratic conviction of the brotherhood and future co-operation of European nations. To strengthen the biblical reference of his poetic proclamation, Mickiewicz turned to the language of the seventeenth-century vernacular Bible translation.

Curiously, the harshest criticism of Mickiewicz's Messianic poems came from two diametrically opposed perspectives: the radical democrats and the Pope. Both repudiated the combination of social radicalism with the Gospel. While the radicals were antagonized by the conservative and religious motifs, the conservatives rejected his instrumentalization of religious symbolism for a democratic agenda. However, Mickiewicz was not alone here: the Christian socialist doctrine of Felicité Lamennais (1782–1854) enjoyed great popularity among Polish émigrés.

The idea of Poland as the 'Christ of nations' is the central motif of the text. However, it is noteworthy that Mickiewicz's messianism was not restricted to 'national martyrdom,' as was the case with the doctrine put forward by Andrzej Towiański. This messianism was closely related to **Joachim Lelewel**'s philosophy of history. In **Lelewel**'s view, the Poles were *per definitionem* the representatives of democratic values, and were supposed to play a crucial role in contemporary conflicts between liberalism and conservatism, this latter being embodied in the Holy Alliance. Similarly, Poland in Mickiewicz's poems was not only suffering as Christ, but its destiny was also to bring salvation to all the nations. The hope for the universal war for the freedom of oppressed peoples envisioned by Mickiewicz was very far from the millenarist doctrine of Towiański's sect. Be this as it may, the popularity of *Księgi...* diminished after the 1863 uprising and with the emergence of new, positivistic ideas formulated by conservatives from Cracow and liberals from Warsaw, both of whom rejected any violent action against the partitioning powers

(see: **Józef Szujski**, *Some truths from our history*, and **Aleksander Świętochowski**, *Political directives*).

The same idea of Poland as a 'Christ of nations' is present in Mickiewicz's most well-known play, *Dziady* (The Forefathers). It is set in Wilno (*Lit.* Vilnius), but the constant presence of divine and evil forces moves it to transcendental spheres. The hero Gustaw (who is re-born under the name Konrad) talks to God as a representative of his Nation, even though he is a prisoner in a Basilian monastery. The events outside the prison walls prove that his voice is heard, and that the omnipotent eyes are watching the sufferings of Polish youth under the tsarist regime. As the action is split into loosely connected events, debate concerning *Dziady* concentrated mostly on the meaning of particular passages. The meaning of '44' (see p. 418) found no satisfactory explanation although many interpretative attempts were made (including through the cabbala and numerology; according to the most plausible explanation Mickiewicz believed that the numerical value of the letters in 'Adam' is 44 in Hebrew), but this did not prevent it being used as a national symbol. It is also unclear whom Mickiewicz believed to be the 'Polish messiah.' But in addition, *Dziady* includes a series of metaphors that were readily intelligible to the contemporary reader—alluding to events from the time of the Kościuszko insurrection (1794) to the November Uprising (1830–1831)—but which have lost their obvious reference in the meantime. Some parts refer to events of strictly regional significance taking place in Wilno, Oszmiana and other places in the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The first of the passages selected, 'The Great Improvisation,' exemplifies Mickiewicz's way of uniting romantic motifs—the loneliness of the individual and the omnipotence of supernatural forces—with the national theme. It illustrates the contradictory feelings of Polish émigrés. On the one hand, they could look on themselves as the leaders of the European democratic movements and as representatives of an ancient democratic tradition (as **Lelewel** argued). Gustaw/Konrad is thus not only a romantic individual whose metaphysical power allows him to address God with the request: "Give me dominion over souls!" He is also a representative of the spiritual power of a suffering (but supposedly soon to be resurrected) Poland. On the other hand, the whole course of 'Great Improvisation' takes place in a prison, where Gustaw/Konrad's words may resemble the mumblings of a madman. Accordingly, the reader could ask whether the whole fight against the dominating (and diabolic) tsar has any chance for success.

The second extract from *Dziady*, the 'Vision of Father Peter', is a renarration of Poland's historical fate in a biblical register. Here the vision of 'the

Christ of nations' found its strongest expression. Mickiewicz confronted Europe with his bitter conclusion, similar to the one made some years later by **Sándor Petőfi** amid the turmoil of the Hungarian War of Independence: Europe silently observes our sufferings. It does not realize (or does not want to realize) that Poland suffers 'for your freedom and ours,' as the propagandistic tag of Kościuszko's insurrection claimed. Among these instances of suffering Mickiewicz describes a paradigmatic experience of the nineteenth-century Polish national movement: Siberia, the place where the country loses its best people.

Dziady has had wide-ranging influence in Polish literature and politics. It is treated as a 'national drama'. Since the *fin-de-siècle* poet and author of the celebrated play *Wesele*, Stanisław Wyspiański (1869–1907), first staged *Dziady* in Cracow in 1901, almost every presentation of *Dziady* became an artistic or political event of great importance. For instance, the 1967 Warsaw production under the direction of Kazimierz Dejmek caused a political crisis: the Communist government deemed the play anti-Soviet, setting off a chain of events that culminated in the anti-Semitic and anti-intellectual campaign of 1968.

MG

The Pilgrim's Litany

Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison.

God the Father, who didst lead thy people out of the Egyptian bondage and didst restore them to the Holy Land,

Restore us to our Fatherland.

Son of God and Savior, who wast tortured and crucified, who rose from the dead and dost reign in glory,

Raise from the dead our Fatherland.

Mother of God, to whom our fathers gave the name Queen of Poland and Lithuania,

Save Poland and Lithuania.

Saint Stanisław, patron of Poland,

Pray for us.

Saint Kazimierz, patron of Lithuania,

Pray for us.

Saint Jozafat, patron of Ruthenia,

Pray for us.

All ye saints, patrons of our Commonwealth,
Pray for us.
From the slavery of Moscow, of Austria, and of Prussia,
Deliver us, O Lord.
By the martyrdom of the thirty thousand knights of Bar, who fell for
Faith and Freedom,
Deliver us, O Lord.
By the martyrdom of the twenty thousand citizens of Praga, massacred for Faith and Freedom,
Deliver us, O Lord.
By the martyrdom of the young men of Lithuania, slain with rods,
dead in mines and in exile,
Deliver us, O lord.
By the martyrdom of the citizens of Oszmiana, slaughtered in the
churches of the Lord and in their houses,
Deliver us, O Lord.
By the martyrdom of the soldiers murdered in Fischau by the Prussians,
Deliver us, O Lord.
By the martyrdom of the soldiers killed with the knout in Kronstadt
by the Muscovites,
Deliver us, O Lord.
By the blood of all the soldiers fallen in the war for Faith and Freedom,
Deliver us, O Lord.
By the wounds, tears, and sufferings of all the slaves, exiles, and pilgrims of Poland,
Deliver us, O Lord.
For a universal war for the Freedom of the Peoples,
We beseech thee, O Lord.
For the arms and the eagles of our nation,
We beseech thee, O Lord.
For a happy death on the field of battle,
We beseech thee, O Lord.
For the burial of our bones in our own land,
We beseech thee, O Lord.
For the independence, unity, and freedom of our Fatherland,
We beseech thee, O Lord.
In the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Amen.

**Translated by Dorothea Prall Radin, in *Poems by Adam Mickiewicz*,
edited by George Rapall Noyes (New York: Polish Institute of Arts and
Sciences in America, 1944), pp. 414–415.**

The Great Improvisation

(KONRAD, in prison, speaks after a long silence):

[...] You, poets, I trample you underfoot,
All of you, sages and prophets,
Whom the world has idolized!
Were you to return among your spiritual children,
Hear the praises and applause of centuries,
Feel yourselves worthy,
And know the daily magic of your fame –
Not all this glory and all these crowns,
Garnered from all the generations of all the years,
Would ever bring you
The plenitude of power and happiness
I feel in this solitary night,
As I sing alone within myself,
As I sing for myself alone.

Yes! I have the power to think and to feel
Never have I felt as I feel at this moment –
Today is my zenith, today is my crisis,
Today I shall know if I am the highest of all, or only a presumptuous man.

Today is the hour of destiny,
Today I shall strain every muscle of my spirit –
It is the hour of Samson,
When, a prisoner and blind, he pondered at the foot of the pillar.
I have thrown off my body,
Spirit, I put on wings!
Yes, I shall fly, fly out of the sphere of the planets and stars,
Till I come to the borderline that separates Nature and God.
I have them, I have them – those two wings!
They will suffice: I shall spread them from sunrise to sunset,
I shall rise on the rays of my feelings – I shall reach you!

I shall look into your innermost feelings.
 To you, God, whom they say feel in heaven,
 I have come, I have come: see what power is mine,
 How high my wings rise!
 But I am a man, and my body is there on the earth,
 There I have loved, my heart has remained in my country.

But my love on the earth did not rest
 On one human being alone,
 Like a bug on a rose,
 On one family, one century alone,
 I love a whole Nation! And I have embraced
 All its generations, past and to come;
 I pressed it to my breast
 Like a friend, a lover, a husband, a father;
 I want to raise it up, make it happy,
 I would make it the wonder of the world!
 I lack the means and have come here to wrest them from you.
 I come here armed with all the power of my reason,
 That reason which wrested your lightning from heaven,
 Explored the motions of the planets and opened the deeps of the sea –
 More than all that – I have the power that comes not from man,
 The power of the feelings that seethe like a volcano within me.
 Only smoking in words now and then.

[...]

Give me dominion over souls! I despise this dead structure
 Called the world, so endlessly praised by the rabble,
 And whether I can destroy it by my words
 I have yet to discover.
 But I feel if I screwed up my will
 And let it suddenly burst,
 I could put out a thousand stars, light up a thousand more –
 For I am immortal! In the sphere of creation
 There are other immortals – but none I have met are superior.
 You are supreme in high heaven, and I, who have sought you up here,
 Am supreme in the valley of earth among men of feeling.
 Never yet have I met you. I sense that you are;
 Let me meet you, make me feel your transcendence! –

I come seeking power; give me power, or show me the way! –
I've been told there were prophets who ruled over souls;
I believe it. What they have done I also can do.
I would have power equal to yours,
As you govern souls, so would I govern them.
(*Long silence*).

(*With irony*):

You are silent! You are silent! No matter. I know you;
I know what you are, I know how you exercise your power. –
Whoever named you Love was a liar;
You are Wisdom, no more.
Men penetrate your ways through the mind, not the heart;
Through the mind, not the heart, they will master your weapons –
Only he who has delved into books,
Into metals, numbers and corpses,
Only he can succeed
In securing some part of your power.
He will understand poisons, gunpowder and steam,
He will understand smoke and lightning and thunder,
He will find all the tricks of the law
Against the wise and the ignorant.
You have delivered the world over to the mind
And left the heart in penance forever,
You have given me the shortest life,
You have given me the strongest feelings. –
(*Silence*)

[...]

Now my soul is incarnate in my country,
My body has swallowed her soul,
And I and my country are one.
Million is my name, for I love
And I suffer for millions.
I look at my unfortunate fatherland
As a son at his father on the wrack,
And I feel all the pain of my people
Like a mother the child in her womb.
I suffer, I rage – while You, happy and wise,
You still govern,

Still judge,
And never are wrong, so they say!

Speak now, if it's true what I learned in the cradle,
What with filial faith I believed,
That you love; if true that you cherished the world you created,
And feel for your creatures a fatherly love,
If a feeling heart too was enclosed in the ark
With the animals you saved from the Deluge,
Or if that heart is not merely a monster,
Born by chance and dead before its time,
If the millions of wretches who cry "Help!"
Only attract your attention as equations to solve,
If love is of some use in the universe,
Or only an error on your part –

Demon Voices

Eagle into hydra!
I'll tear out its eyes.
To battle!
Smoke! Fire!
Roaring and thunder!

Angel Voices

Out of the bright sun,
Lost comet!
Where will your flight end?
Without end,
Without end...

You are silent! Yet I've laid bare the depths of my heart,
I implore you: give me power; only a part,
A part of that power that pride has won on the earth.
With that particle only, what happiness I could create!
You are silent! – You refuse it to the heart, then give it to the reason.
You can see I am first among men, among angels,
That I know you better than your archangels know you;
I deserve that you cede me the half of your power –
Am I right... You are silent...But I do not lie.
You are silent. You trust in the strength of your arm!
Don't you know that the heart can burn what the mind cannot break?
Look into this furnace, my heart:
I compress it, make it burn the more fiercely,
I force it into the iron band of my will,
Like a ball in the deadly cannon.

Demon Voices

Fire! Fire!

Angel Voices

Pity! Mercy!

Speak! For I shall fire on this Nature of yours;
 And if I cannot reduce it to rubble,
 At least I shall shake the foundations of your dominion;
 For I shall send forth a voice to the confines of creation,
 A voice that will echo from generation to generation,
 I shall shout that you are not the father of the world but...

Voice of the Devil:

The Tsar!

Translated by Louise Varèse in Adam Mickiewicz, *The Great Improvisation* (New York: Voyages, 1956).

The Forefathers. Vision of Father Peter

Father Peter (prays, lying in the form of a cross)
 Lord, what am I before thy countenance?
 Dust and naught.
 But when I have confessed my nothingness to thee,
 I, dust, may yet hold converse with my Lord.
 (He beholds a vision)
 A tyrant hath arisen, Herod! – Lord, the youth of Poland
 Is all delivered into Herod's hands.
 What do I see? Long snowy ways, with many crossroads,
 White roads that stretch through wastes too distant to descry!
 All running to the north, that far, far country,
 As rivers flow;
 On, on they stream, and one leads straight to iron portals,
 That other, like a stream that vanishes beneath the ground,
 Drops into unseen caverns, lost to view;
 And this one finds its outlet in the sea.
 Over the roads they fly, a mass of wagons

Like clouds driven onward by the winds.
All to the north they go. O Lord,
They are our children, and is such their fate,
Exile, great Lord?
Dost thou destroy them all, so young, so young?
And wilt thou wipe our race out utterly?
But see – a child escapes, grows up – he is our savior,
The restorer of our land!
Born of a foreign mother, in his veins
The blood of ancient warriors – and his name
Shall be forty and four.

O Lord, wilt thou not deign to speed his coming,
My people to console?
Nay, they must suffer to the end – I see a rabble:
Tyrants and murderers run and catch at him –
I see my nation bound, all Europe drags him on
And mocks at him:
“To the judgment hall!” – The multitude leads in the guiltless man.
Mouths, without hearts or hands, are judges here,
And all shout, “Gaul! – Let Gaul be judge!”
Gaul found no fault in him – and washed his hands;
And yet the kings shout, “judge him! Punish him!
His blood shall be on us and on our children;
Crucify Mary’s son and lose Barabbas!
He scorneth Cæsar’s crown: crucify him,
Or we will say, thou art not Cæsar’s friend.”
And Gaul delivered him unto the people –
They led him forth – and then this innocent head
Grew bloodstained from the mocking crown of thorns;
They raised him up in sight of all the world –
The people thronged to see – and Gaul cried out,
“Behold the free and independent nation!”

I see the cross. – O Lord, how long, how long
Must he still bear it? Lord, be merciful!
Strengthen thy servant lest he fall and die!
The cross has arms that shadow all of Europe,
Made of three withered peoples, like dead trees.

Now is my nation on the martyr's throne.
 He speaks and says, "I thirst," and Rakus¹ gives him
 To drink of vinegar, and Borus,² gall,
 While Mother Freedom stands below and weeps.
 And now a soldier hired in Muscovy
 Comes forward with his pike and pierces him,
 And from my guiltless nation blood has gushed.
 What hast thou done, most stupid myrmidon,
 Most heartless! Yet he only shall repent –
 And God will pardon him his sins at last.

O my beloved! He droops his dying head
 And now in a loud voice he calls, "My God,
 My God, and why hast thou forsaken me?"
 And he is dead.

(Choirs of angels are heard in the distance, singing the Easter hymn. At the end come the words, "Alleluia, alleluia.")

My beloved hath risen,
 And ascended into heaven.
 His garment white as snow
 Floats down below,
 And wide unfurled
 Wraps in its spreading raiment all the world.
 He hath gone up on high
 Yet is not vanished from our sight.
 And from his triple eye
 Shines as from triple suns a radiant light,
 And he displays his pierced hands to all.

Who is this man? He is the viceroy upon earth.
 I knew him as a child. – But ah, since then
 How have his soul and body blossomed forth!
 An angel boy is leading him – the man of dread
 Is blind – he hath a threefold countenance
 And threefold brow. – And like a baldachin outspread,
 The book of mysteries above his head

¹ Austria (in Old-Polish Rakusy).

² Prussia (Borussia).

Veils him from nearer glance.
Three cities are his footstool – when he calls,
Three ends of earth must tremble. – Now there falls
A voice from heaven like thunder’ mutterings,
“Lo, this is Freedom’s viceroy visible
On earth to all!”
On glory he will build the Church’s vast expanse
He is exalted over men and kings.
Upon three crowns he stands, himself uncrowned:
His life – the toil of toils; his appellation –
Of nations, the one nation –
Of warrior blood, a foreign mother bore
The man; his name, that shall resound
For ages unto ages, shall be forty-four!
Glory! glory! glory!
(*He falls asleep*)

***Dziady*, Scene V (The vision of Father Peter), translated by Dorothea Prall Radin, in *Poems by Adam Mickiewicz*, edited by George Rapall Noyes (New York: Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, 1944), pp. 291–294.**

HENRYK KAMIEŃSKI: VITAL TRUTHS OF THE POLISH NATION

Title: *O prawdach żywotnych narodu polskiego* (Vital truths of the Polish nation)

Originally published: Brussels, 1844

Language: Polish

The excerpts used are from Andrzej Walicki and Jan Garewicz, eds., *700 lat myśli polskiej: Filozofia i myśl społeczna w latach 1831–1864* (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1977), pp. 410–413.

About the author

Henryk Kamieński (pseudonym: Filaret Prawdoski) [1813, Ruda (near Lublin) – 1866, Algiers]: politician and publicist, the intellectual leader of the Polish irredentist circles in the 1840s. As a young boy he took part in the November Uprising. After the amnesty he lived on his estate, working on philosophical and economic works. In the 1840s he was involved in the organization of radical conspiracies in the Congress Kingdom. His book ‘Vital truths of the Polish nation’, published in 1844, was the theoretical analysis of a social (peasant) revolution. He was arrested in 1845, convicted and sent to Siberia for five years. After he was released he moved to Switzerland where he worked on an analysis of Russian culture and the Russian state as well as on a theory of ‘guerrilla-warfare.’ Kamieński is usually associated with his cousin Edward Dembowski, leader of the unsuccessful Cracow revolution in 1846. Both of them stemmed from the gentry, and were probably the most ardent Polish revolutionary agitators of the period.

Main works: *Pamiętniki i wizerunki* [Diaries and sketches] (1951); *O prawdach żywotnych narodu polskiego* [Vital truths of the Polish nation] (1844); *Katechizm demokratyczny* [Democratic Catechism] (1849); *Le Russie et l’avenir* (1858); *Filozofia ekonomii materialnej ludzkiego społeczeństwa* [Philosophy of the social economy of human society] (1843–45); *Pan Józef Bojalski* [Mr. Józef Bojalski] (1854).

Context

Kamieński’s text originates in the political debates of the Polish émigrés in the wake of the collapse of the November Uprising (1830–1831). The crucial question, which numerous political and literary writings attempted to answer,

concerned the cause of the failure. The overwhelming majority of the émigrés rejected the explanation in terms of Russian military superiority and searched for internal causes. The most critical assessment of the events was provided by publicists of radical democratic convictions. Among these exiles, a new political movement was formed: the *Towarzystwo Demokratyczne Polskie* (Polish Democratic Society). Kamiński's book, which fused the struggle for independence with a program of social revolution, was one of the most influential and representative formulations of the radical platform. According to Kamiński, independence could be achieved only through a mass insurrection. Several years after publishing 'Vital truths,' Kamiński prepared a shorter version, called 'Democratic Catechism.' This became very popular and was used by the emissaries sent to Poland to prepare the new uprising.

Kamiński's ideology met with criticism from one of the greatest Romantic poets, Zygmunt Krasiński (1812–1859). In his 'Psalms of the Future' (1845) he upheld—in contrast to Kamiński—the idea of national solidarity and refused to tie the question of independence to the question of serfdom. The political conflict shifted to the tricky field of poetry, and Kamiński did not venture to continue the debate, leaving the answer to another outstanding romantic poet, Juliusz Słowacki (1809–1849). Słowacki's answer, 'To the author of Psalms of the Future', was written in 1845–1846 but was published only in 1848, to be followed by the answer by Krasiński.

In 1846, the tragic events of the Galician '*Jacquerie*' brought bitter disappointment for the radicals who believed in an imminent national revolution. In spite of the efforts of the emissaries and the decrees of the democratic government of Cracow, the uprising was crushed by the Galician (Polish and mainly Ruthenian) peasantry manipulated by the Austrian authorities. In the district of Tarnów, they even slaughtered several hundred of the rioting Polish gentry. These events generated a new set of conservative arguments, asserting that the radical propaganda was to blame for the anti-gentry behavior of peasants. Nevertheless, the theory of a peasant revolution was popular among Polish democrats as long as the majority of Polish peasants were still subordinated to the landowners (their enfranchisement took place only during the January Uprising in 1863–1864).

After the defeat of the 1863 uprising, mainstream nationalism parted company with democratic ideology. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, 'national democrats' (see **Roman Dmowski**, *Thoughts of a modern Pole*) as well as the agrarian movement sought to attract the Polish peasantry as they were interested in gaining the support of every social strata. The radical democratic tradition of the 1840s influenced the rhetoric of Polish socialism in

the late-nineteenth century (see **Józef Piłsudski**, *On patriotism*), and the socialists perceived themselves as heirs of that tradition. Finally, Kamiński's (and the other radical democrats') ideas were instrumentalized in actual political debates even after 1945 when they were integrated into the new ideological canon as alleged precursors of Polish Communism. Not surprisingly, Marxist historiography tended to emphasize the social program of the radical democrats, leaving aside the national question (and of course its anti-Russian edge).

MG

Vital truths of the Polish nation

We, a nation crushed by despotism, a nation that has fallen so many times, are now expected to rise and battle for our independence and thus win freedom for the neighboring peoples! Weak as we have always been, we are now expected to exhibit strength! For this to become possible, we need first and foremost to analyze the causes of our fall, to understand the meaning and circumstances of our enslavement, since nothing in this world has ever happened by accident. A nation should think sensibly unless it wants to become an idle playground of ill fate—our misfortunes could appear as destiny's bitterly ironic fancy, a demonical and unexplainable set of circumstances, were they not endowed with some deeper sense signaling our mission in the history of humanity. Our country's imprisonment and partition did have their causes as well as consequences, and thus the former should prove helpful in explaining the latter. Our fall was inevitable, but as a close scrutiny of its circumstances reveals, it has never led to the dissolution or rejection of our nationality as something useless and burdensome; instead it proves that our fate has been to grow and prepare for fulfilling our historic mission under the eye of misfortune and misery which has no equals among tutors of individual men as well as entire nations.

As for the reasons of Poland's decline, we shall not indulge here in elaborate historical explanations but only highlight its primal roots, which had to evolve one way or another. A nation as great as ours could not have fallen any other way than due to its own impotence; the causes of the partitions and our humiliation are to be traced within ourselves, in our progressing weakness and eventual disintegration—a decline cannot be explained otherwise than as an immediate consequence of feebleness. All this comes down to the question: "What were Poland's weaknesses?" Some see them in the issue of

the election to the throne, the gentry's insubordination and the *liberum veto*, some blame the magnates and their preoccupation with private ends, while others mention the inadequate organization of government, the lack of a permanent army or public funds, etc. However, all these arguments do not touch upon the very foundation of our national impotence.

Our weakness must have indeed been alarmingly serious, as not only were we conquered by means of very inferior forces, but what is more, the conquest met with hardly any resistance and struggle. The scale of the armed protests of the Confederation of Bar or Kościuszko's uprising was so embarrassingly small considering the size of the nation that we must treat them as recklessly strained efforts rather than as true rebellions against foreign invaders. Had the entire country eagerly and with love roared aloud for its homeland's independence, and had it, when faced with the threat of danger, united all its efforts, there would never have been any invasion, and the enemy who dared to attack our country would have been destroyed—a free land would burn under his feet and the flames of its population would devour his body. What deprived our nation of integrity—this divine bond between the sons of a single soil, which unites them in defense of their country in need—was all the same the reason of its decline, as it drove Polish society into impotence, which had to end in a fall. As long as despotism is alive, every weak nation will be conquered, and solely by its own weakness—no other causes for a decline of a weak nation can be found after even the most scrupulous search.

What was that which brought disintegration and thus undermined our nation's strength? What caused the patriotic affection for homeland and independence to decay? Indeed, the flame of this affection must have been faint at the time when the then-great nation could resolve only to small and insignificant tasks. In order to answer these questions we should direct our insight to the conditions of those living in servitude, to the privileges which turn men into possessions much like landed property or cattle, to the oppression of the most numerous social class, a class that is the source of the country's strengths and hopes for independence. Could those who are oppressed inspire enthusiasm for independence in the same way as the free? For a slave, no country is ever a good mother, but rather a vicious stepmother who instead of love and care gives him only misery, humiliating imprisonment, injustice, and blight. Our nation, deprived of its human dignity, humiliated, and depraved by patient bowing, could not have been any other than it was, that is, dead and unstirring. This is why Poland was conquered without a great national battle and after some—only insignificant—talks.

Therefore, what impaired our nation's integrity, what made it incapable of opposing foreign invasion, and what as a result brought about our country's fall, was nothing other than the oppression of our people. We were destroyed because our unity and thus also our strength were abhorrently violated by class differences. Our uprisings kept failing because we were unable to remove the stigma of our grandfathers' sins; we were unable to awaken our people from the spell cast by their sinful heritage. Our country surrendered to foreign violators because the privileged few who led its defense had nothing in common with the rest of the nation, and guarded their own interests rooted in injustice placing against the common good. We have never won, because not once did Poland, its entire people, stand united in determination to achieve victory.

It is a natural reaction against foreign violence to unify the nation, and shape it, using the existing sources of vitality, so that it becomes unanimous in valuing freedom above everything else and one in efforts to achieve this freedom. Before we undertake this effort, however, we need to prove, using as a premise the causes of our present misery, that our fall was not fatal but was a mere stumble; that our decay is not death but a disease soon to be cured. We have said that the causes of the nation's decline can be found within it, not in external circumstances; applying this rule further, the decision whether this nation is to die or stay alive lies also within itself not in external circumstances which on the surface may deny that we are alive and erase us from the ranks of nations, but which sooner or later will have to accept the undeniable signs of life, the independent actions of the oppressed. For it is as impossible to conquer a nation that fervently defends its sovereignty as to keep it in chains when it generates and spreads the fire of patriotic love, when it is inspired by the spirit of unity and ready to crush everything that opposes this togetherness, the lack of which has lost the country once already, but which shall save it when sustained. Nationality is a knot that joins the sons of one soil; when it is eased the nation weakens, but when tightened it strengthens the nation regardless of external events, for better or for worse. And when this knot is undone completely, then a nation dies and disintegrates into minor elements which then become part of other nations' bodies because it has no part to play in the journey of humanity. In the case of Poland, this knot has been weakened so that the nation was not able to withstand the pressure of surrounding despotism and therefore had to give in to it. However, the knot was not dissolved—in fact, it seems to be getting stronger and stronger, considering the growing number of uprisings and the new emotional intensity attached to the words 'homeland' and 'independ-

ence.' All this is taking place under foreign oppression, which nevertheless cannot block the flow of our national life or even obstruct its progress and development. However, a mere acknowledgement of the fact is not sufficient—we need to scrutinize its causes and draw conclusions in order to undertake actions that will eventually lead our country to salvation.

A nation dies when it does not pursue any goals put forward for it by humanity, when the idea that embodies these goals does not bind its members together. All external attempts at obstructing a nation's progress towards such goals shall never bring doom upon it, nor even a momentary pause in its existence, because a nation's life relies on its integral strength which perpetuates its actions. The only way to destroy a nation is to take away the goals in which its power is invested and to replace them with others that are greater and more common and which absorb like useless refuse the ones that were previously cherished. Then, predictably, a nation is dissolved. There is only one rightful kind of pressure in the world, against which no one protests, and that is the burden of spirituality—the only one which inspires and perfects humanity, the only one that is never violent but always a choice of man's free will. Our enemies never have exerted and never will exert this pressure upon us, because this is our own weapon that will not obey their command but listens only to those who march with the current of humanity's progress, not to tyrants who always proceed against it. If the despots ever wanted to master this weapon they would have to reject despotism, for the mere touch of progressive things would turn their potency to dust. Spiritual conquest is the only force which can lead nations to unite into a larger whole. And this force is our weapon, precisely our weapon, just as military force is the exclusive weapon of humanity's enemies, for we represent the spiritual power while they represent the material one. Poland used its spiritual force in the times of its greatness, and for this reason Lithuania cast itself into our brotherly arms; the two differing and previously hostile nations forged together a holy and indestructible alliance to work together towards the higher goals of humanity, and since then nothing has been able to force them apart. Today, no one will say that this was merely a result of Jagiełło's marriage to Jadwiga¹—alliances between nations are not a matter of personal relations; it was the Polish customs as laws, polished by Christianity, education and liberties which resulted from it, that attracted the young country of Lithuania, that conquered it spiri-

¹ Jadwiga (ca. 1374–1399), the queen of Poland, married in 1386 the Lithuanian duke Jogaila (baptized as Władysław, ca. 1351–1434), which is referred to as a founding act of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

tually and brought about the eternal brotherly union between the two countries, until death do them part.

Poland is not dead! For it still has great aims to pursue: the spreading of freedom in Western Europe, which can be realized only through our first regaining our own independence. It is the pursuit of these goals through the achieving of sovereign existence that is this country's binding force, a force which unites a nation of twenty million people ready to do anything once they know its potential, because spiritual conquest can only be achieved by this country and not against it. Poland shall never die, because it evolves in accordance with the general spirit of humanity which is the only guarantee of enduring; but the despotic regimes which hold her in their grip must pass away, as they go against humanity and are capable of building, if anything, only petty things.

Translated by Zuzanna Ładyga

PETAR II PETROVIĆ NJEGOŠ: THE MOUNTAIN WREATH

Title: *Gorski vijenac* (The mountain wreath)

Originally published: Vienna, 1847

Language: Serbian

Modern edition: P. P. Njegoš, *Gorski vijenac* (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1947).

The excerpts selected are from p. 50 and pp. 128–131 of the English edition: James W. Wiles, trans., *The Mountain Wreath* (London, Allen & Unwin, 1930).

About the author

Petar II Petrović Njegoš [1813, Njeguši (Montenegro) – 1851, Cetinje (Montenegro)]: prince-bishop and poet. He was born into the Njegoši clan, the ruling family of Montenegro, in whose hands were united the spiritual and political leadership of the principality. After the death of his uncle, Petar I Petrović, in 1830, he became prince-bishop and ruler of Montenegro, under the name Petar II Petrović Njegoš. He was educated by Sima Milutinović Sarajlija, a learned Serb from the Habsburg Empire and an adherent of romantic aesthetics. As ruler Njegoš tried to undermine the tribal structure of authority in the principality and create the basis of a modern centralized state mainly by introducing the rudiments of an educational and communication infrastructure. He eliminated the office of the civil governor traditionally elected from the rival Radonjić clan and established a council consisting of twelve local chieftains to perform the executive and judicial as well as legislative functions of government. After visiting Russia, the staunchest and most influential political ally of Montenegro at the time, he brought back equipment for the first printing house, which was opened in 1834 in Cetinje. During his reign the first Serbian-language school in the country was founded, also in Cetinje. Njegoš personally knew **Vuk Stefanović Karadžić**, whom he had met in Vienna in 1833 and whose work on language reform he strongly supported. Although he was autodidact in matters of literature and the arts, he created lyrics and poems of extraordinary strength and influence. Inspired by patriotic enthusiasm and the spirit of folk culture, he wrote about the ‘heroic past’ in a way that brought it to the fore and related it to the present. His philosophically grounded epic poems have shaped Montenegrin and Serbian collective memories.

Main works: *Luča mikrokozma* [The ray of the Microcosm] (1845); *Gorski vijenac* [The mountain wreath] (1847); *Lažni car Šćepan Mali* [The False Tsar Stephen the Little] (1851).

Context

Gorski vijenac was published in 1847, in the same year as the second edition of the *Srpski rječnik* (Serbian Dictionary) of **Vuk Stefanović Karadžić**, the important language and cultural reformer, and *Rat za srpski jezik i pravopis* (The struggle for the Serbian language and spelling) by Đura Daničić. What was significant about these three books was the fact that all were written in the vernacular language (*narodni jezik*). This differed significantly from the more elitist Slavo-Serbian idiom, a late eighteenth-century ‘literary language’ combining Church Slavonic, the popular idiom and many borrowings from Russian, coined by the emigrant Serbian clergy in the Habsburg lands in the second half of the eighteenth century. The simultaneous appearance of these three crucial works signaled the triumph of Vuk Karadžić’s language reform and at the same time the formation of an alternative literary and political program. The change in language paradigms ended a conflict that had existed for decades between the Church literary culture and the emerging Serbian cultural revival, resolving it in favor of the latter.

Since its appearance in the mid-nineteenth century, *Gorski vijenac* has served as an inspiration for the national projects of both the Serbs and Montenegrins, as well as in the construction of Yugoslav cultural unity and common identity. The question of whose identity is at issue has been raised and disputed in various contexts. While at the time when Petar II Petrović Njegoš wrote his celebrated poem the ethnonyms Serbian and Montenegrin were used practically interchangeably, this had not been the case throughout history, nor does it apply to the current cultural and political debates that surround the issue of the national identity of the Serbs and the Montenegrins.

The ambiguity of the ‘national message’ of the poem is due to the complexity of its cultural references. The verses of *Gorski vijenac* are inspired by the legends of the Battle of Kosovo (1389), the single most significant symbol in Serbian history and mythology. Therefore, *Gorski vijenac* transcends the centuries of historical “non-being”, between the loss of national existence on the field of Kosovo and its subsequent resurrection, and connects the ‘mythical forefathers’ and the modern founders of nation. Apart from promoting the amalgamation of Serbian and Montenegrin national fates, the text is filled with references to other nations and religions, particularly Muslims (*Turci*) and Venetians (*Mleci*, *Latini*). These ‘Significant Others’ are conspicuously denounced, and their ‘normality,’ even their ‘human condition,’ is called into question throughout the text. Through the description of an event of local significance, the so-called “destruction of the converts to Islam” (*is-*

traga poturica) that allegedly took place in Montenegro at the beginning of the eighteenth century, Njegoš summarized the mission of Montenegro and created the core of its national program for years to come. Njegoš sets the eradication of Islamized Serbs against the backdrop of the struggle of the Serbian people for liberation. But through his poetic and mythological approach he goes beyond narrow national limits and transports it to the domain of general motives of freedom, death and resurrection.

The “destruction of the converts to Islam” was a fictionalized clash between the Montenegrin Christian clan leaders and converted Montenegrin Muslims for supremacy over the country. In the excerpt, one of the Christian leaders, Voivode Batrić, expresses the conflict in the following words: “Our land is small and it’s pressed on all sides,” and adds “Bairam cannot be observed with Christmas”. The ultimate fight between Christians and Muslims, in which the Muslims of Montenegro were massacred, is presented in the final part of the poem. The dialogues of the thirty-four Montenegrin clan leaders with Prince-Bishop Danilo and Abbot Stefan introduce the main actors of the event and set forth their attitude to their Islamized kin: the rebirth of the Serbian nation will only become possible through the death of its “infidel traitors.” These dialogues are also intended to reveal the archaic way of life and the tribal customs and world-view of the Montenegrins. Significantly, because of their familiarity and aphoristic form, many verses from *Gorski vijenac* have passed into proverbs.

The reception of the poem is intertwined with the history of the complex relationship between Serbian and Montenegrin identity-discourses. The question whether the Montenegrins are in fact of Serbian origin or whether, on the contrary, they have autochthonous ethnic roots has been the key question of these identity debates, particularly during the twentieth century. Indeed, various opinions relating to that question can be found from as early as the end of fifteenth century, when the names “Montenegro” and “Montenegrins” were for the first time mentioned in the sources. Since then three main theories about the ethnic origin of the Montenegrins have crystallized. According to the first, the Montenegrins are of Serbian ethnic origin, and Montenegro and Serbia represent two Serbian states. A core argument for this theory is the documented habit of Montenegrin rulers, including Bishop Vasilije, Petar I Petrović and Petar II Petrović Njegoš, to declare themselves Serbs. In the case of the author of ‘The mountain wreath,’ this could be explained as due to the formative impact of Sima Milutinović Sarajlija, who brought the young prince up on stories about the glorious Serbian past that nurtured Njegoš’s feeling of belonging to Serbian history and tradition. The second view

argues that the Montenegrins are in fact of Croatian origin, and the third says that the Montenegrins represent an autochthonous ethnic entity. This theoretical division also had political connotations and consequences. While the theory of the Serbian origin of the Montenegrins was dominant throughout the nineteenth century, the idea of a separate and autochthonous Montenegrin identity started to develop at the beginning of the twentieth century under Prince (from 1912, King) Nikola, and was formulated concretely by Sekula Drljević in 1920s. In fact, it could be said that stronger insistence on the separateness of the Montenegrin national identity began with the creation of the Serbian-Croatian-Slovenian Kingdom in 1918.

As for the appropriations of Njegoš's text for the purposes of national-building, there are several historical phases in its interpretation, as documented by Andrew Wachtel. Characteristically, although Njegoš saw himself as a definitely Serbian poet, his epic came to be later canonized as the most important work of 'Yugoslav' literature. In the first stage, 'The mountain wreath' was treated as Njegoš's greatest work and as a major achievement of South Slavic romanticism. It has been republished a dozen times since its original publication in 1847, and an authoritative commentary by the Slavist Milan Rešetar was produced in 1890.

After the founding of the 'Yugoslav' state, a new nation was 'searching' for its national poet and Njegoš seemed a suitable candidate for this role. 'The mountain wreath' was thus reinterpreted in a Yugoslav key and this project was supported with the transportation of Njegoš's remains from Cetinje to a mausoleum on the top of Mount Lovćen in 1925. The post-war Yugoslav Communist government further enhanced Njegoš's cult as a Yugoslav 'national poet.' The celebration in 1947 of the 100th anniversary of the first publication of 'The mountain wreath' served as a timely occasion for playing out yet another side of the text. The rhetoric used in describing and promoting the jubilee makes clear that Njegoš's belonging to the Montenegrin nation was emphasized, which could be related to the Yugoslav Communist policy of 'brotherhood and unity' and the promotion of the Montenegrins who were accorded the status of a separate 'nation' in 1943. Thus, the poem has been used as a source for various layers of collective identification, both on a national (Serbian, Montenegrin, even Yugoslav) and ideological (socialist) level. Nevertheless, the divergent readings of 'The mountain wreath,' even if undertaken in different social and political contexts, have focused on the same set of 'eternal' values and relations which feature in the poem, such as the notions of manhood, bravery, heroism, betrayal and the ideals of heroic sacrifice for the sake of the community.

In Serbia and Montenegro Njegoš's epic is still read uncritically, disregarding the complexities of the historical formation of the image of the Islamized population. Njegoš's work has never been viewed from a historical distance, and his 'message' was constructed as an ideal representation of the nation. In other words, the universality of Njegoš's artistic achievement has been blurred with the historically conditioned and notably political aspect of the epic. Conversely, this perception has induced many recent observers to depict Njegoš as the catalyst of Serbian hatred of Muslims and his epic as a blueprint for genocide.

IE

Petar II Petrovic Njegos: The Mountain Wreath

Voivode Batric

Turkish brothers—may I be forgiven! —
 we have no cause to beat around the bush.
 Our land is small and it's pressed on all sides.
 Not one of us can live here peacefully,
 what with powers that are jawing for it;
 for both of us there is simply no room!
 Accept the faith of your own forefathers!
 Guard the honour of our dear fatherland!
 The wolf needs not the cunning of the fox!
 Nor has the hawk the need for eyeglasses.
 Start tearing down your minarets and mosques.
 Lay the Serbian Christmas-log on the fire,
 paint the Easter eggs various colours,
 observe with care the lent and Christmas fasts.
 As for the rest, do what your heart desires!
 If you don't want to listen to Batric,
 I do swear by the faith of Obilic,
 and by these arms in which I put my trust,
 that both our faiths will be swimming in blood.
 Better will be the one that does not sink.
 Bairam¹ cannot be observed with Christmas!
 Is that not so, Montenegrin brothers?
 (...)

¹ A Turkish word meaning feast-day.

Abbot Stefan

I have now reached eighty years of my life.
But ever since the loss of my eyesight,
I have lived more in the spirit's kingdom,
though my body still has hold of the soul,
keeps and hides it within its boundaries,
as underground cavern protects a flame.
I have traveled through much of the wide world.
Of God worship, the most sacred places
which the earth has raised up toward heaven,
I have beheld, one after another,
and I've inhaled the altars' holy smoke.
I have climbed up the holy Mount Olive,
from which the most horrible prediction
of its ill fate Jerusalem once heard.
I have also visited all three caves:
where the sun of Christianity rose,
where the heavens cast light on the manger,
and where the kings came with their offerings
to bow before the one heavenly child.
I have seen, too, Gethsemane's Garden,
defamed by sin, passion, and betrayal.
The evil wind put out the holy lamp!
We see ugly thorns that have multiplied
and are scattered across the fertile fields,
and Omar's temple² has reared into the sky
on Solomon's sacred foundations;
St. Sophia is but a stable now.
Unusual are the traits of earthly things.
They are full of crazy transformations.
All of nature keeps nourishing itself
on the purest milk of the clear sunlight.
But the milk, too, changes into hot flame;
today it sears what yesterday it fed.
Not all rivers on this earth do possess

² Reference to the 'mosque of Omar,' built on the hill Moriah in Jerusalem by Mohammed II in the seventh century.

the kind of bed they should have for their flow.
Do we not see these terrifying things
devastating the earth mercilessly?
Our time on earth and human destiny,
two faces of highest absurdity,
the most profound science without order,
the children or the fathers of man's dreams —
do we only imagine this order,
whose deep secret we cannot unravel?
Is it true that things are as they appear,
or do our eyes only deceive us so?
The world demands some kind of firm action,
duty gives birth to new obligations,
and defense is closely tied up with life!
Nature provides everything with weapons
against a force that is oft unbridled,
against trouble and dissatisfaction.
Sharp spikes are there to protect the corn stalks,
and thorns defend a rose from being plucked.
Myriads of teeth has nature sharpened
and has pointed innumerable horns.
Various tree-barks, wings, and speed of feet,
and the array of seeming disorder,
always follow some definite order.
Over all this huge conglomeration
again a wise, mighty force reigns supreme.
It won't allow for evil to triumph.
It snuffs the spark, strikes the snake in the head.
Man does defend his wife and his children.
People defend their church and their nation.
Honour is a nation's sacred relic.
Generations must bear their own burden.
New needs give birth to new powers in man.
Every action strengthens human spirit.
Heavy pressure brings thunder to action.
The blow calls forth a spark out of the stone,
without the blow the spark stays imprisoned.
Suffering is the virtue of the Cross.
Tempered in trials and suffering, the soul

feeds the body with electric fire,
through hope the soul is bonded with Heaven,
as the sun's ray binds droplet with the sun.
What is man? (And it's his fate to be man!)
A small creature deceived oft by the earth,
yet he sees that the earth is not for him.
Is not the real more puzzling than the dream?
If man attains an honest name on earth,
his being born then wasn't at all in vain.
But without his honest name—what is he?
Generation which was made to be sung,
muses will vie for many centuries
to weave for you garlands worthy of you.
Your example will teach *gusle* singers
how one should speak of immortality!
A fierce struggle lies ahead for you all:
Part of your tribe has renounced its own roots
and is therefore serving the dark Mammon!
The curse of shame has now fallen on it.
What is Bosnia and half of Albania?
They're your brothers of the same parentage.
United all, there's enough work for all!
Your destiny it is to bear the Cross
of the fierce fight against brothers and foes!
The wreath's heavy, but the fruit is so sweet!
Without death there is no resurrection.
Under a shroud of glory I see you
and our nation's honour resurrected.
I also see the altar turned eastward
and a fragrant incense burning on it.
Die in glory, if die indeed you must!
Wounded honour inspires courageous hearts;
those hearts cannot tolerate such illness.
The altar by pagans desecrated
will once again receive the grace of God.

Translated by Vasa D. Mihailovich, available at http://www.rastko.org.yu/knjizevnost/umetnicka/njegos/mountain_wreath.html

FRANZ GRILLPARZER: FIELD-MARSHAL RADETSKY

Title: *Feldmarschall Radetzky* (Field-marshal Radetzky)

Originally published: *Constitutionelle Donau-Zeitung*, no. 68, (8 June 1848).

Language: German

Modern edition: Franz Grillparzer, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by Peter Frank and Karl Pörnbacher, 4 vols., (München: Hanser, 1960–1965), vol. 1, pp. 218–319.

About the author

Franz Grillparzer [1791, Vienna – 1872, Vienna]: dramatist, writer and poet. He was the son of an influential Viennese lawyer, Wenzel Grillparzer. He attended the University of Vienna, where he studied philology and law. In 1813, he worked in the Court Library and (after holding various other offices) in 1823 he became a clerk in the treasury. From 1832 until his retirement in 1856, Grillparzer was the director of the state archives. He was also the founding member of the Austrian Academy of Sciences in 1847. From 1861, he became a life member of the Upper Chamber of the *Reichsrat*. The publication in 1816 of a part of his translation of Calderón's drama, 'Life is a Dream,' in the newspaper *Wiener Moden-Zeitung* impressed Joseph Schreyvogel (1768–1832), the literary and artistic director of the *Burgtheater*, who became Grillparzer's spiritual mentor. In 1819, Grillparzer wrote the highly acclaimed tragedy *Sappho*. Grillparzer's most prolific period was between 1820 and 1831. His first historical drama, *König Ottokars Glück und Ende* ('King Ottokar's luck and end') (1823), in which he described the futility and the vanity of worldly greatness, caused him problems with Austrian censorship. Although Grillparzer was critical of the Metternich regime, he did not become a supporter of the revolution in 1848. One of his most famous poems from that period, *Feldmarschall Radetzky*, was a paean to the field marshal who crushed the revolution in the Italian provinces of the Austrian Empire. Although he acquired an iconic status after 1850, it was not until the centenary of 1891 that the German-speaking world realized that it possessed in him a dramatic poet of world value. Grillparzer was no mere epigone of the classic period, but a poet who, by assimilating the ancient Greek example with the imaginative forms of German classicism and lyricism of the Spanish poetry, had established a new pattern for the dramatic verse in European literature.

Main works: *Die Ahnfrau* [The ancestress] (1817); *Sappho* (1819); *Das goldene Vliess* [The Golden Fleece] (1821); *König Ottokars Glück und Ende* [King Ottokar's

luck and end] (1823); *Der Traum ein Leben* [A dream is life] (1831); *Tristia ex Ponto* (1835); *Feldmarschall Radetzky* [Field-marshal Radetzky] (1848); *Selbst-biographie* [Autobiography] (1872); *Die Jüdin von Toledo* [The Jewess of Toledo], (written between 1847–1851, published in 1872); *Ein Bruderzwist im Hause Habsburg* [A Brother-quarrel in the House of Habsburg] (written between 1847–1851, published in 1872); and *Libussa* (written between 1847–1851, published in 1872).

Context

The revolution of 1848 put an end to the Metternich regime in Austria. If in Vienna revolutionaries were mainly concerned with overthrowing Metternich, other national groups of the Empire, such as Hungarians, Czechs, Italians and Romanians, were rather preoccupied with achieving their national demands. Many Austrian intellectuals, although sympathetic to the ideals of the revolution, considered the demands for national independence expressed by other nations during the revolution of 1848 as undermining the very existence of the Austrian Empire. They thus welcomed the victories of the imperial army under Josef Radetzky (1766–1858) against the Italian revolutionaries. For the supporters of the Habsburgs in Vienna, Radetzky was the providential person restoring the order disrupted by the revolutionary chaos. Animated by this form of Habsburg patriotism, Johann Strauss the Elder (1804–1849), for instance, composed the ‘Radetzky March,’ which came to symbolize the unique nature of the House of Habsburg.

It is in this historical context that Grillparzer expressed his pro-Habsburg allegiance. While he was an ardent critique of the Metternich regime in the 1830s, it was not, however, the first time that Grillparzer made public his edging towards political conservatism. Already in *König Ottokars Glück und Ende*, he explored the theme of royal suffering and redemption. Nevertheless, with the outbreak of the revolution Grillparzer became acutely aware of the radical transformation the Austrian state was experiencing. Between mid-March and mid-July 1848, he drafted four open letters, intended as warnings to the Viennese population about the dangers of disorder. For example, in the poem, *Mein Vaterland* (My Country), which appeared in the first number of the new journal *Constitutionelle Donau-Zeitung* (April 1848), he supported the revolution, but added an anxious admonition against deserting old values; his respect for the orderly life of ‘*Biedermeier*’ Austria was as strong as his desire to liberate society from the encroachment of censorship and repression. Grillparzer further explored his ambivalent position between the ideals of the revolution and the mourning of lost values in *Feldmarschall Radetzky*,

which was published in June. The poem derived its dramatic tension from the ambivalence between public responsibility and individual motivation. The poem also reflected Grillparzer's political dilemmas. Although he was an opponent of Metternich, Grillparzer was sceptical about the 'fever of freedom' and the complete equality advocated by revolutionaries. The revolution in Vienna, he believed, was characterized by the lack of a programmatic concept and the absence of systematic leadership and of personalities who were capable of defending the rights and freedoms which had been achieved.

In his memoirs, Grillparzer mentioned his "lack of enthusiasm for liberty" during the revolution of 1848. The libertarian trends, both the movements towards democracy and what he called "the ridiculous issue of nationalism," were threatening the existence of the Habsburg Monarchy. He was thus particularly concerned with the disruptive effects of separatist nationalisms that in his opinion were trying to destroy the 'fatherland.' The theme of loyalty towards the 'fatherland' continued to preoccupy Grillparzer after 1848. *Feldmarschall Radetzky* established Grillparzer's reputation as a pro-Habsburg supporter, and this was a position he cultivated until the end of his life. With the publication of *Ein Bruderzwist im Hause Habsburg*, considered his most important historical play, his political sympathies towards the Habsburgs were again exposed.

The theme of the 'Habsburg experiment' continued long after Grillparzer's death. Joseph Roth (1894–1939), the famous interwar Austrian writer, elaborated Grillparzer's tradition in his *Radetzkymarsch* (1932). In retrospect, the 'Habsburg myth', as personified by the 'supra-national' Austrian army and bureaucracy, became a substitute for a defunct Habsburg Empire, seen as a cosmopolitan place and protector of the small nations of East Central Europe.

MT

Field-marshal Radetzky

Lead on, Commander, lead our cause!
 'Tis more than glory beckons,
 Austria is united in your camp
 While we are scattered fragments.

Our folly and our vanity
 Have split us into factions
 But when you lead your men to war
 One spirit guides their actions.

Yet which of them would dare to claim
The wisdom that you own?
To see our dreams and hopes fulfilled:
That vision is yours alone.

Your guard does more than keep the watch;
It keeps us safe from harm
And fearlessly defends our cause
When nightly sounds the alarm.

Your camp – a city on the move –
Is all things to your men;
If flames destroy it they'll go down
And never rise again.

Your ministers and generals
Fear not to use their swords
To keep obedience in peace,
And peace in midst of wars.

Slavs and Magyars have no dispute
Linguistic or sectarian;
The call 'Vorwärts' means but one thing
In Czech or in Hungarian.

For mutual help in mutual need
Has founded many a nation;
Death alone divides mankind,
Life binds in aspiration.

May your glorious war inspire us
To extend our hands in union.
When each and all are so conjoined
The victory will be won.

Translated by Robert Russell

SÁNDOR PETŐFI: NATIONAL SONG

Title: *Nemzeti dal* (National song)

Originally published: First printed as a pamphlet in Pest on 15 March 1848

Language: Hungarian

The modern edition is *Petőfi összes művei* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1956), pp. 37–38.

About the author

Sándor Petőfi [1823, Kiskőrös (Central Hungary) – 1849, Segesvár (*Rom.* Sighișoara, *Ger.* Schässburg, present-day Romania)]: poet. His parents were of Slavic origins; his father was a butcher. He studied in various secondary schools all over the country. For some time an actor, he later joined the army but was discharged in February 1841 because of ill health. His first poem was published in *Athenaeum* in 1842. After working as an actor in Kecskemét for a time, he eventually moved to Pest, where, with the help of Mihály Vörösmarty (1800–1855), he published an edition of his poems. He met Júlia Szendrey in Nagykároly (*Rom.* Carei, present-day Romania) and married her in September 1847. He was a prominent figure among the group of young radicals that promoted the Revolution of March 1848. His poem, ‘National song,’ printed as a pamphlet, became the symbolic text of the revolutionary demonstrations. After a failure in institutional politics, Petőfi entered the military and, after serving in Debrecen, moved to Transylvania. From January 1849 he served in the army of General Józef Bem (1794–1850). While his propagandistic services were highly appreciated by Bem personally, Petőfi fell into conflict with the military leadership and subsequently resigned his commission. On 30 July 1849, however, he rejoined Bem’s army, and was killed on the following day in a battle between the Hungarian and Russian forces at Segesvár. As his body was never found, there has been a lasting controversy about the circumstances of his death: from time to time the legend resurfaces that he was actually taken captive by the Russians and his grave is to be found somewhere in Siberia, which even inspired excavations in the 1990s. Already in the 1850s Petőfi had become ‘canonized’ as the symbol of the 1848–49 Revolution and War of Independence, and he has remained a crucial cultural and political reference ever since.

Main works: *A helység kalapácsa* [The hammer of the village] (1844); *Versek, 1842–1844* [Poems, 1842–1844] (1844); *János vitéz* [János the Brave] (1845); *Szerelem gyöngyei* [The pearls of love] (1845); *Versek, 1844–1845* [Poems, 1844–

1845] (1845); *Felhők* [Clouds] (1846); *Összes költeményei* [Collected poems] (1847); *Az Egyenlőségi Társulat proclamációja* [The proclamation of the Society of Equality] (1848); *Újabb költeményei, 1847–1849* [New poems, 1847–1849] (1851).

Context

In the 1840s the Hungarian reform movement underwent a process of radicalization, culminating in the outbreak of the Revolution in March 1848 and the subsequent establishment of the first modern representative government in Hungary, which in turn was followed by the revolutionary war against Vienna. The Revolution also brought about the triumph of a circle of young intellectuals of radical democratic convictions, usually referred to as the ‘March Youth,’ who emerged as a powerful cultural and political lobby-group in the mid-1840s. In contrast to the previous generation of liberal politicians stemming from the middle nobility and the country-gentry, these radicals came either from the petty nobility or from non-noble background; they were mostly but not exclusively educated in Protestant secondary schools, and represented the first cohort of a new social phenomenon, the intelligentsia, who earned their living by publishing literary works, translating, and working in journalism.

Their emergence meant the shift of focus of public life from the traditional framework of gentry politics and antiquarian scientific journals towards new forums of sociability and public debate such as literary magazines, cafés and, in general, the urban space. Their appearance also effected a considerable paradigm shift in terms of the traditional itinerary of reception of European intellectual trends. While the previous generation was mostly formed by German romantic ideas or ideas mediated by a German cultural filter (such as the ‘stadial history’ model of the Scottish Enlightenment), the new generation emerged under the influence of French romantic literary and political doctrines, especially those of Jules Michelet, Alphonse de Lamartine and François Mignet. Some of the characteristic figures of this generation subsequently became eminent cultural or political personalities, for example, the greatest Hungarian romantic writer Mór Jókai (1825–1904), the important late-romantic poet and political journalist János Vajda (1827–1897), and the liberal politician Dániel Irányi (1822–1892), who played a considerable political role in the post-1849 emigration and subsequently in political life after the Compromise of 1867. Others, such as the charismatic political writer and historian Pál Vasvári (1826–1849), perished during the War of Independence,

while others again retreated from public life after 1849 and became completely forgotten.

The iconic figure of this generation was doubtlessly Sándor Petőfi. A romantic poet eminently concerned with shaping the self-perception of his national community, Petőfi operated with numerous discursive modalities, ranging from folkloric genre-poems to visionary poetry on the 'universal mission' of the Hungarians. Among these works the 'National song' has a pivotal position, due partly to its poetic strength, but also to its symbolic political role. The poem was written originally for a 'Reform Banquet' organized by university students to manifest their support of **Lajos Kossuth's** liberal constitutional agenda. As events took a more radical turn, and Petőfi emerged as the tribune of the revolutionary youth, the printing of the poem came to signalize the collapse of censorship, and it was distributed as a pamphlet to the public during revolutionary demonstrations. It soon became the symbol of the revolution and became incorporated into the rituals of the new political system, for instance forming part of the oath taken by new recruits to the revolutionary guard. The image of Petőfi reading his poem to the enthusiastic masses on March 15 from the steps of the National Museum—an event which actually did not take place in this form—became the iconic representation of the Revolution.

The poem compresses the lessons of Hungarian history into an urgent 'either-or' of revolutionary action, projected on a tripartite historical framework. The mythical past was characterized by liberties, which were consequently lost, so that, in the more immediate past, the nation was suffering under total slavery. The contrast of freedom and slavery is reinforced by other sharp symbolic alternatives, like that of the chain and the sword. The chain of slavery can be broken and the freedom of the nation can be regained if all members of the community are unified in a symbolic oath of allegiance to the nation, pronounced in front of the God of the Hungarians (this is an ambivalent reference to the presumed pre-Christian Hungarian monotheistic religion centered around a God of War, thematized in the late-eighteenth century pre-romantic literature seeking to create a Hungarian pre-historical mythology, but its roots go back as far as the early-modern discourse of 'elect nationhood').

In the poem, Petőfi seeks to reshape the national community, transcending any social and legal differences. He submerges all the counter-positions into a gigantic contrast of individual interests *versus* the nation, activating the Messianic potential of the national ideology, projecting the cult of the founders of liberty, i.e., the present generation, to a pious future. He thus creates a

framework of national transcendence, where the conception of divinity transcends the common Christian theological notion and becomes the object of veneration in terms of the secularized ‘religion of the revolution’—in many ways evoking the Jacobin rhetoric during the French Revolution, the history of which Petőfi read ardently also during the revolutionary days of March 1848.

In the dispute over the direction of the revolution the radical Petőfi was far from being unconditionally accepted, and soon after the glorious days of March he came to clash with the liberal mainstream of the political elite who became increasingly irritated by his anti-institutionalism and radical rhetoric. Later on, however, his figure was totally identified with the memory of the 1848 Revolution. He became an object of veneration immediately after the fall of the banners and his mysterious disappearance. His historical charisma became so formidable that later on every regime, regardless of its ideological orientation, sought to gain symbolic benefit from his cult.

BT

National song

On your feet now, Hungary calls you!
 Now is the moment, nothing stalls you,
 Shall we be slaves or men set free
 That is the question, answer me!
 By all the gods of Hungary¹
 We hereby swear,
 That we the yoke of slavery
 No more shall wear.

Slaves we have been to this hour,
 Our forefathers who fell from power
 Fell free and lived as free men will,
 On land that was their own to till,
 By all the gods of Hungary
 We hereby swear,
 That we the yoke of slavery
 No more shall wear.

¹ In the Hungarian original it is singular: “by the God of Hungarians.”

Whoever now his life begrudges
Deserves his death with thieves and drudges,
For setting his own worthless hide
Above his country's need and pride.
By all the gods of Hungary
We hereby swear,
That we the yoke of slavery
No more shall wear.

The sword shines brighter than the fetters
It is the finery of our betters,
Of slaves and fetters we grow bored.
Leap to my side, ancestral sword.
By all the gods of Hungary
We hereby swear,
That we the yoke of slavery
No more shall wear.

Magyars, once more our name and story
Shall match our ancestors' in glory.
The centuries of shame and hurt
Can now be washed away like dirt.
By all the gods of Hungary
We hereby swear,
That we the yoke of slavery
No more shall wear.

And wheresoever we may perish
Grandchildren those graves shall cherish
Singing our praises in their prayers
To thank us that our names are theirs.
By all the gods of Hungary
We hereby swear,
That we the yoke of slavery
No more shall wear.

**Translated by George Szirtes, in: *The Lost Rider: A Bilingual Anthology*
(Budapest: Corvina, 1997), pp. 129–131.**

REQUESTS OF THE SLOVAK NATION

Title: *Žiadosti slovenského národa* (Requests of the Slovak Nation)

Originally published: As a leaflet in May 1848 in Levoča (*Ger.* Leutschau, *Hun.* Lőcse)

Language: Slovak

Translated from Dušan Čaplovič et al., *Dokumenty slovenskej národnej identity a štátnosti* (Bratislava: Národné literárne centrum, 1998), pp. 307–310.

Context

By the mid-1840s, three complex problems crystallized in the Hungarian part of the Habsburg Monarchy, namely, the need to dismantle the Metternichian bureaucratic centralism, the inevitable reform of the feudal socio-economic structures and, finally, the necessity to deal with the nationality question. Hungarian reformers called for modernization and Hungary's administrative and economic emancipation from Vienna, envisioning a modern Hungary as a unified nation with a standardized language and a unified educational system. The steps towards creating a Hungarian nation-state provoked counter-reactions among many of the other ethnic groups living in Hungary, including the Slovaks.

The second half of the 1840s is marked by an increased politicization of the Slovak national movement, previously oriented mainly towards cultural issues. In 1844, a nation-wide cultural society, *Tatrín*, was founded, followed by the 'Union of Slovak Youth' a year later. In subsequent years, many other Slovak organizations, including business companies, popular education societies and cultural associations were established. In August 1845, **Ľudovít Štúr** founded the first Slovak political newspaper, *Slovenskje národnje novini* (Slovak national newspaper), and made it a mouthpiece of the Slovak national movement. In this newspaper, written in the new orthography, he and his adherents presented their views on the language and education issues, but

gradually they also shaped a new Slovak political program. It was based on the precept that the Slovaks were a nation with a right to their own language, culture, schools, and eventually political autonomy within Hungary. The latter point was a natural outcome of the development of the Slovak movement. However, it would have led to an administrative and territorial decentralization of Hungary based on ethno-cultural principles, which was unacceptable to the Magyar political elite, that wavered between the radical vision of modernist centralization and the outlook of traditional gentry liberalism with its focus on the county administration as the main locus of politics. In 1848, Slovak and Hungarian revolutionary claims came to clash in a violent way. In spring, the Slovak leaders started to spread their ideas among the Slovak peasantry and met with a certain popular response, especially in the western and central regions of the area populated by Slovaks. In May 1848, a public meeting gathered in Liptovský Mikuláš (*Hun.* Liptószentmiklós), where a Slovak national program, put together by the leading personalities of the movement (such as Štúr, Jozef Miloslav Hurban, Michal Miloslav Hodža, Ján Francisci, and Štefan Daxner) and known as the 'Requests of the Slovak Nation,' was proclaimed and accepted.

In the 'Requests,' the Slovak leaders declared their patriotic allegiance to Hungary, but required that it should imply a guarantee of freedom and equality for every nation in Hungary. The Hungarian state ought to be changed to a union of free nations. As a distinct and self-contained national community living in the "Hungarian homeland," the Slovaks demanded a proportional representation in the Hungarian Assembly, the creation of a Slovak Diet to administer their own region, the introduction of Slovak as the official language on Slovak territory, and the use of Slovak in educational institutions from elementary schools to universities. They also called for universal suffrage and democratic rights, including freedom of the press and of public assembly. Further, the peasants should be released from serfdom and their lands returned to them.

The 'Requests,' combining as they do a national, a political and a social vision, can be considered the first consistent political program in modern Slovak history. However, the hope of its authors of bringing about at once a fully developed Slovak nation and of passing over the necessary social, economic and political stages in the forming of a modern nation by revolutionary means proved to be unrealistic. The provisional Hungarian revolutionary government formed in April 1848 hoped that its liberal constitutional and administrative reforms, including the abolition of serfdom and the extension of civil rights, would gain favor with the population irrespective of ethnic

provenience. Hence they considered the activists, with their demand for territorial autonomy on an ethnic basis, as provocateurs and questioned their legitimacy. In the fall of 1848, the Slovak leaders changed their strategy. They ceased to link the future of the Slovaks with Hungary and tried to establish Slovakia as an autonomous unit under the direct control of Vienna, in the spirit of the Austro-federalist conception expressed by the Kremsier (Cz. Kroměříž) constitutional project. However, these hopes proved unreal following the triumph of the ultra-conservative circles at the Court and the consequent marginalization of the federal option. Thus, the eventual defeat of the Hungarian revolution brought a return to bureaucratic centralization rather than any federalization of the Monarchy. In the next Slovak political program, the 'Memorandum of the Slovak Nation' of 1861, the Hungarian-federalist option was again in the center, and this remained the basic orientation of Slovak political thought up until 1914.

PL-MK

Requests of the Slovak nation

"Requests of the Slovak nation addressed to His Majesty the King-Emperor, to the Hungarian Diet, to His Excellency the Hungarian Palatine, the King's Deputy, to the Hungarian Ministry and to all brethren by humanity and nationality," on the 10th of May, 1848.

I. After sleeping for nine hundred years, the Slovak nation is awakening as the autochthonous nation in this Hungarian homeland, realizing that this holy country and homeland—being the spring and cradle of legends of the ancient glory of its ancestors, and the stage on which our Slovak fathers and heroes spilled their blood for the Hungarian Crown—has been until recently only a stepmother, treating the Slovaks mercilessly and constraining their language and nationality in the iron bonds of disgrace and humiliation. Nevertheless, in this moment of its awakening, the Slovak nation wishes to forget the centuries of injustice and disgrace, it forgives itself as well as its jailers, and nothing else moves its cheerful heart more than the holy zeal of love of and burning desire for securing its freedom, nationality and homeland. As the autochthonous nation and the once sole possessor of this holy land, it calls, under the banner of this age of equality, all the nations of Hungary to respect equality and brotherhood. And for its part it proclaims that it does not wish to oppress, offend, curtail, even less to uproot any nationality in Hungary—but

it also demands from the Hungarian nations that they too, for their parts, be filled by such Hungarian patriotism and that by respecting Slovak nationality they become worthy of friendship and love of the Slovak nation. [...]

Therefore we request:

II. That *one general parliament of brotherly nations* be established on a basis of equality composed of all nations living under the Hungarian Crown and represented there as nations—and each of the national representatives be bound to represent his nation in its language as well as to know the languages of the nations at the parliament represented. Besides this parliament of the country, we request:

III. That *independent national parliaments*, which will debate the issues concerning the good of both nation and country, be established, with the aim to decide geographic boundaries, in such a way that each nation would and could relate strongly to its national center; so that as a result there would not be a Slovak minority forced to serve and submit by a Magyar majority or a Magyar minority by a Slovak majority. Therefore, we request the strictest protection of national rights and freedoms.

IV. That the representatives of all the Hungarian nationalities would be bound by an oath to work in the general parliament according to the guidelines formulated by those who delegated them; and in the case of faithlessness and treason to the nation, they would be subjected to a penalty determined by those who delegated them. The Slovak nation, in particular, has sufficient reason to stress and support this request, as it hosts in its ranks the highest number of national traitors.

V. We request that the law according to which Hungarian—already at this early stage of the reform of the country—has been prescribed as the mandatory official language, thus forcing our nation by law to lawlessness, be changed at once so as to introduce the mother-tongue into general public proceedings. Because the holy word of freedom is disgraced when the Slovak nation, which does not understand Hungarian, is condemned to silence during the proceedings carried out in an incomprehensible language. [...]

VI. We request the establishment of national schools, that is, elementary schools, burgher and council-schools, grammar schools, and institutes for the education of teachers and priests, and then institutes of higher learning, particularly gymnasiums, lyceums, academies, polytechnic institutes and a university. All these educational institutions are to be established on the basis of free education: the language of teaching for the sons and daughters of the Slovak nation should be none other than Slovak, so the Slovak nation could thus educate its children in loyalty to the nation and to the country.

VII. We request that the Magyar counties in their schools and in higher and lower literary institutes establish departments of the Slovak language for Magyars and that the Slovak counties establish departments of the Magyar language for Slovaks, so that these nations may move closer to each other and particularly that the Slovaks may understand the Magyars and the Magyars the Slovaks when each is speaking their own language in the Parliament.

VIII. Led by the spirit of the equality of nations, we request that all dominance of certain nations over other nations be uprooted, and thus no nation be forced to abandon in the least its aspirations: therefore, we request that the Slovak nation be able without any obstacle to demonstrate its nationality with its own colors and flag. We consider the red-white colors to be Slovak, the red-white-green colors, Magyar, the red-white-green colors with the Hungarian emblem, those of the country. Also we request that the head and staff of the Slovak national guard be only Slovak.

IX. We request that the right to vote be determined not by the property and estate but by the spirit and right of equality, and therefore we demand that every Hungarian citizen loyal to his nation, unstained by crime or offence, be allowed, if older than twenty years of age, the right to vote, and if older than twenty-four years of age, the right to be elected. [...]

X. We request the freedom of the press without a press law, freedom to publish newspapers and journals without a bond, freedom to establish presses also without a bond; furthermore we request complete freedom of assembly and association for the sake of public debate about issues of the common good; we also request personal freedom while travelling in the country, as we have unfortunately to complain that the newly acquired constitutional freedom is suppressed by a campaign of terrorization and intimidation spreading in the Slovak districts to such an extent that even a speech to a gathering in the open is considered an instance of riotousness.

XI. We request that measures be taken towards the restitution of the rights and properties of our fellow-citizens living in villages, small towns and hamlets, who have been, since ancient times by various people in various ways, cheated of and forced to abandon their hills and pastures, fields and trades and their other property. These measures are to ensure that these wronged citizens receive back their property, that is, their hills and pastures, fields and trades etc., and that they and their descendants obtain all the corresponding property rights. Furthermore, we request that the allodial serfs be freed from their duties, especially those who have served for thirty-six years of corvée, in the same way as the urbarial serfs were freed from their urbarial duties. We

also request that the *regalia beneficia* be granted to the towns and villages. [...]

XIII. Knowing that in the neighboring region of Galicia, which too is under the rule of Austria, the brotherly nation of the Poles has not yet achieved the freedoms that we are enjoying, because a wretched bureaucracy is constantly creating great obstacles, we request that all nations which are under the Hungarian crown sound through their official channels the voice of Christian and human compassion and address His Majesty with the plea that to this unfortunate nation finally freedom and mercy be granted.

XIV. The Slovak nation considers the fulfillment of these just requests as the condition for its national security and happiness; expressing in advance its respect, gratitude and trust to the glorious Ministry, as well as to all the Hungarian citizens who will support these requests, while we would consider the postponement or circumvention of these our requests as a condemnation of our nation to its former blindness and serfdom.

Translated by Petr Roubal and Gordon MacLean

JEVREM GRUJIĆ: A VISION OF THE STATE

Title: *Obzor države* (A vision of the state)

Originally published: In the review *Neven Sloge*, Beograd, 1849, pp. 175–181

Language: Serbian

D. Perović, D. Prljević, Radoslav Perović, eds., *Istorijska čitanka: odabrani tekstovi za istoriju srpskog naroda* (Beograd: “Znanje”, 1949), pp. 159–161.

About the author

See **Jevrem Grujić and Milovan Janković**, *South Slavs, or the Serbian nation with the Croats and the Bulgarians*, pp. 154–155.

Context

Jevrem Grujić belonged to the first generation of Serbian students who studied abroad, and returned home bringing the European ideals of democracy, constitutionalism and civic liberties. Grujić participated in founding the ‘Association of Serbian Youth,’ a group which nurtured and transmitted ideas of liberal nationalism and Slavic unity. The Association was modeled after the revolutionary and literary youth organizations of the period that had been set up throughout Central and Western Europe. Grujić was sensitive to the revolutionary vibrations of the time; he cooperated with the Serbian youth movement in Hungary and participated in the events of 1848 in Vojvodina, where the Serbian demands for collective rights eventually clashed with those of the Hungarian liberal nationalist revolutionaries seeking to combine legal emancipation and national homogenization.

Grujić, together with Jovan Ilić and **Milovan Janković**, played an important role in the St. Andrew’s National Assembly in 1858 when the call for a parliamentary check on monarchic power for the first time gained support.

Through their work the ideas of Slavic brotherhood were intertwined with the doctrines of liberalism. The first generation of liberals in Serbia, which emerged in the late-1840s and 1850s, believed that individual freedom and the 'progress of the nation' could be secured through the institution of parliamentary representation of the sovereign people elected on the basis of universal male franchise. The necessity for a broadly democratic government was Grujić's basic political credo and he never abandoned this idea. His pivotal ideas about 'internal' and 'external' liberty were given public life in his 'Vision of the state', first published in the magazine *Neven Sloje* (Never-fading unity), a publication connected with the Association of Serbian Youth. **Jovan Skerlić**, a distinguished literary critic at the turn of the century, argued that this text could be seen as "the first declaration of liberalism in Serbia, the first step towards a future, liberal Serbia, and the seed of the program of the United Serbian Youth."

The program of liberalism, in Grujić's reading, flowed naturally from ancient Serbian national traditions and institutions. Reared in a peasant milieu, Grujić venerated the functioning of rural social institutions and remained close to the ideas of communalism and egalitarianism. The institutions of 'peasant democracy', particularly that of a popular assembly endowed with extensive powers, represented for Grujić the ideal of a sovereign state organization—intended, as he put it, to "make the nation aware of what it means to live in a state." In his later work, practical as well as theoretical, on law-making and constitutionalism, Grujić adopted the approach of the German historical law school, as exemplified by Georg Friedrich Puchta and Friedrich Carl von Savigny. That approach implied that the norms and rules of positive law should be rooted in history, in the experience and life 'of the people,' in the 'spirit of the folk' and its natural sense of justice. These ideas undoubtedly touched on Grujić's understanding of the people's way of life and people's customs, which he considered "good and benign." That was particularly visible in his later works, including his ethnographic descriptions in *Slaves du Sud* (1853) and in his 'Memoirs' (1864).

In the extract below Grujić first considers the circumstances under which the Serbian people were living. He goes on to point out their subordinate position under Turkish rule, lack of education, passivity and overall backwardness. He poses the question of who can perform the task of the liberation and development of the Serbian people and with what support. Rather than just relying on foreign help, Grujić puts emphasis on the self-emancipatory capacities of the nation. He thus goes on to stress the importance of education, especially of teaching "what rights the nation should have", as being crucial

to allowing the Serbian people to free themselves from oppression and reach the condition of an enlightened nation that “will find even the lightest foreign yoke unbearable.”

IE

A vision of the state

But what is more important, brothers, is that we see the present state of affairs in our country and amongst our people. *Our people today are not free either outwardly or inwardly.* They are not outwardly free because they pay tithes to Turks—. ¹ They are not free inwardly because they do not have—, they do not know, and they are virtually not allowed to know, the kind of rights they have. They are a pure means that are used by some—and then others for their own ends. Insufficiently informed, they, poor folk, follow those that pull them along, all with false promises; they then place their heads in the yokes of self-will, laugh at beating, ignore gaols, serve prison sentences, bow to wheels, carry out all orders, as long as others do not prevent them from exercising their will. They thus exhaust their energy and ruin themselves in order to satisfy the insatiable—. *Our people do not have their own free will, but not because they are not capable of it.* Consequently, they do not live in prosperity but rather in backwardness. And therefore our state (or rather its leaders) has not fulfilled their task.

But who will now fulfill this task? Will it be those who compare the present burden of shameful dependence and dismal tutelage with the former burden of insatiable Turkish tyranny, saying: It has never been better than today, while for internal policy they apply the principle of *Strike and rule!* Will a people strong enough of arm to throw off the yoke of others, despite still being underdeveloped, albeit bright, be able to recognize its rights, bravely to express its own will before all, put an end to all base flattery and blind acceptance and seek and exercise its own rights? Or V— ... Honest ends require honest means.

Who then can perform that task and with whom is it best to do it?

This remains unsolved for the time being. But if the former is known, the latter will be solved by the spirit of the times. That spirit calls and will call when the time is right on those who have the will and readiness to follow it [...]

¹ The dashes: — denote blank spaces in the text. These blank spaces either are the result of censorship or possibly allusions on the part of the writer.

We have already stated that education does not suffer the slavery of others or its own. Education is therefore vital to enable the Serbian people to free itself from oppression. And the people must:

1) For its outer liberation, *make the entire Serbian nation aware of its former empire and its brilliant future; it must furthermore become better acquainted with and more closely linked to other Slav branches;*

2) For its inner liberation, *make the nation aware of what it actually is, what rights it should have; what government is, why it exists, from whom it exists and what its limitations are; the nation must be told what it means to live in a state and it must be called upon to live in that way.*

Such an enlightened nation will find even the lightest foreign yoke unbearable, both for itself and for its brothers; it will wish to rid itself of it and must do so, as it has the necessary physical strength that should be channelled; it remains only for it to have the necessary moral strength. And what a morally strong nation can do was demonstrated by Miltiades who, with ten thousand morally determined Greeks, defeated one hundred thousand whip-forced Persians at Marathon. Then, we shall be able to join in an ode to the Slav nation to the benefit of mankind and become free together with Serbs across the rivers Sava, Danube, Drina and Timok [...] and with Bulgarians on the Struma *by proffering hands* and not swords and then, as a free nation *under one banner*, without any foreign tutelage.

I think, my brothers, that this is the best and the most fitting path our nation can take and be prepared to win freedom for itself, preserve it and enjoy it wisely. And whoever amongst Serbs or Serbian communities has the will and the spirit for this, may he set to work. There will be many obstacles (the illiteracy of the majority of the people and, what is worse, the lack of freedom of the press, etc.). However, if the Serb feels himself capable of achieving this—he will emerge victorious, as he will have many to help him in this task: *the people,—and time is on his side*. All he needs is fraternal love, unity and strength of will, inspired by the principle of *all for one and one for all for the progress of the nation*. May he march forward without fear; victory may not be close, but it is certain. May he march forward and he will hear the echoes of the words: “Long live the independent, constitutional and, eventually, *free Serbian state*.”

Translated by Krištof Bodrič

ZSIGMOND KEMÉNY: AFTER THE REVOLUTION

Title: *Forradalom után* (After the revolution)

Originally published: Pest, Gusztáv Heckenast, 1850

Language: Hungarian

The modern edition of the text is Zsigmond Kemény, *Változatok a történelemre* (Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1982), pp. 185–373, the excerpts used are from pp. 366–373.

About the author

Zsigmond Kemény [1814, Alvinc (*Rom.* Vințul de Jos; in Transylvania, present-day Romania) – 1875, Pusztakamarás (*Rom.* Cămărașul, in Transylvania)]: novelist, essayist, politician. Kemény was the descendant of an ancient Transylvanian aristocratic family. He was educated at the famous Calvinist College in Nagyenyed (*Rom.* Aiud, present-day Romania), where he studied law and philosophy. In 1837 he moved to Marosvásárhely (*Rom.* Târgu Mureș, present-day Romania), where he became an apprentice lawyer, and in 1838 to Kolozsvár (*Rom.* Cluj, *Ger.* Klausenburg, present-day Romania), where he became clerk in the Governor-General's office. In 1839 he went to Vienna, where he spent a year and a half, attending lectures at the University and preparing for a literary career. Over the next decade he became acquainted with the most important political and cultural figures of his generation and edited the journal *Erdélyi Híradó* (Transylvanian Herald). In 1847 he settled in Pest and worked on the staff of the liberal *Pesti Hírlap* (Pest Gazette). As parliamentary representative of the Kolozsvár district he was involved in the revolutionary events of 1848. Moving to Pest, and then following the government to Debrecen, he served as adviser to the Ministry of Interior until the very end of the revolutionary struggle. After the defeat he went into hiding, but later surrendered to the Austrian authorities in Pest, who, after two years of investigation, finally dismissed the case against him. In the 1850s he edited the influential journal *Pesti Napló* (Pest Journal). In the 1860s he supported the moderate line of **Ferenc Deák** against **Lajos Kossuth**. With his belletristic works, especially his historical novels focusing on Transylvania, he gained a distinguished reputation as a prose writer. His essays and novels, written in an unmistakable style, are often considered the best expressions of Hungarian Late Romanticism.

Main works: *A mohácsi veszedelem okairól* [On the causes of the catastrophe of Mohács] (1838); *Korteszkedés és ellenszerei* [Electioneering and its antidotes] (1843);

Gyulai Pál (1847); *Forradalom után* [After the revolution] (1850); *Még egy szó a forradalom után* [One more word after the revolution] (1851); *A szív örvényei* [The vortices of the heart] (1851); *Özvegy és leánya* [The widow and her daughter] (1855–1857); *A rajongók* [The enthusiasts] (1858); *Zord idő* [Murky times] (1858–1862); *Tanulmányai* [Studies] (1870).

Context

The Transylvanian aristocrat and writer Zsigmond Kemény was a supporter of the liberal movement in the 1840s, developing a reformist program convergent with that of the ‘Centralists’ around **József Eötvös**. Though he served the revolutionary government until the very end, he grew increasingly disenchanted as the revolution radicalized, blaming **Kossuth** for abandoning the more organic style of reform and for subordinating the common good to his personal “dictatorial aspirations.” After the collapse of the revolution Kemény’s was among the first critical voices to be heard in the midst of collective trauma and Austrian reprisals. Kemény positioned himself in a very precarious way. While he harshly criticized the revolutionary leadership, he also opposed the aristocratic ‘old-conservative’ political platform, which tried to resume politics as if the Revolution of 1848 had not taken place. Against both, Kemény sought to defend the liberal reforms and considered the formation of a modern ‘bourgeois society’ crucial for the survival of the nation. He maintained some hope of the modernizing potential of the ‘neo-absolutist’ government of Vienna, which was partially drawn from politicians (like the Prime Minister, Alexander Bach, for example) who had a liberal political past. While most of the Hungarian liberal cultural-political elite of the previous decade was either in emigration or adopted a position of ‘passive resistance,’ rejecting any form of cooperation with the government, Kemény did not exclude the possibility of convincing Vienna of the necessity of continuing the modernization of Hungarian society, even if such a policy might stem from the logic of administrative rationality and not from liberal doctrines.

Along these lines, Kemény’s political essays as well as his historical novels, written in the 1850s, were meant to actively ‘shape the public’ and reconsider the basic tenets of the Hungarian national discourse. On the one hand, he evoked the tragic moments of the past when the Hungarian nation went through similar ordeals as after 1849, thus seeking to create a historical perspective for the contemporary situation. On the other hand, he sought to convince his audience of the historical and geo-political necessity of cooper-

ating with Austria, pointing out that, due to the complex ethno-national composition of the region, Hungary could retain its territorial integrity only in the framework of the Habsburg Monarchy.

The pamphlets 'After the revolution' and 'One more word after the revolution' are usually considered the most characteristic instances of the conservative potentials of Hungarian 'political Romanticism.' With a sweeping rhetoric of collective self-criticism Kemény called the nation to repentance after the "excesses" of the revolution and envisioned a model of cooperation with the Viennese administration which would allow Hungarian society to recover what it had lost during the upheavals. He couched this argument in an organicist discursive framework, flavored with a considerable dose of historical pessimism. Nevertheless, this rhetoric was eventually turned to support a vision of moderate liberalism focusing on the concept of balance (*súlyegyen*), whereby he suggested that progress is based on the intricate interplay of revolutionary radicalism and conservatism. Thus, in discursive terms his works might well be defined as Romantic, although the author's political program contained elements characteristic of the Enlightenment (with frequent references to Montesquieu and Rousseau) and also prefigured some 'modernist-institutionalist' claims—an ideological mixture being characteristic of nineteenth-century Hungarian liberalism.

In the concluding pages of 'After the revolution' Kemény recapitulates his entire argument. Showing how the nation faces the threat of disappearance, he calls on all political camps of the country to exercise self-restraint and at the same time to face the realities of defeat. Turning rhetorically to the Austrian authorities, he asserts that relaxation of military control would not lead to a new revolt, as the character of the Hungarians does not contain any propensity for waging guerilla warfare after a lost struggle. Turning to his compatriots, he warns them against "day-dreams," that is, making common cause with some combination of foreign interests and hoping to reactivate the revolutionary fight. While pointing out the responsibility of individuals and social groups implicated in the revolution, he also asserts that the defeat was predetermined by the differences in the balance of strength between the Empire and the Hungarians, making it vain to seek to identify some individual mistake as the root of the collapse. Furthermore, he argues that national regeneration should be based on collective remembrance and the reconsideration of the national past. Finally, he envisions a new common ground of political cooperation of all the forces committed to the national cause. They should search for ways of healing the wounds of the civil war and embrace policies which take into account the interests of the Hungarian nation, the geopolitical

situation of the country—as rooted in the irrevocable unity of the Empire—and the dangers of radical European ideological trends (like socialism) which, by negating the civilizing process, the constitutional framework, and the principle of private property, undermine the basis of society.

After its appearance, the pamphlet was harshly criticized by many prominent figures from the revolutionary days. While the aims of the author might have been conditioned more by considerations of finding a *modus vivendi* with the Habsburg administration, it turned out to be a paradigmatic text of cultural and political self-positioning. It had an enormous impact and inspired many later works, among them **Gyula Szekfű**'s 'The three generations' and **László Németh**'s essays. On the whole, it can be considered as an important, although far from mainstream, version of the 'national Romantic' discursive paradigm in Hungarian culture.

BT

After the revolution

I shall relate then what the aim of this pamphlet has been.

The aim that was ever before my eyes while writing it was the following:

1, It was my modest wish to admonish those high-born ones whom destiny gave indeed much, although not everything, in shaping the future of our nation; then, to admonish all who support the cause of well-ordered freedom, and tell them that despite the recent revolution our homeland possesses so many elements of moderation, this people can provide so much evidence of sober and sedate thinking, and the nation shelters in her bosom so many imperishable materials of order and stability—applying this word in its noblest sense—that we may no longer entertain any doubt that whoever has at heart the survival and flourishing of the Monarchy should bestow extraordinary care upon promoting the interests of Hungary and the Hungarian nation.

2, I intended to tell my compatriots that due to the calamities of the past years a fanciful direction of patriotism may develop now amongst us which feasts the eyes of imagination on distant realms, turning the attention towards the East and the West, dissolving in empty longings and still cherishing hopes about changes that can never take place and would not be useful anyway.

I am well aware that the number of those who cherish such idle yearnings is relatively small among the intelligentsia.

I am well aware that it is diminishing day by day.

But since many are disappointed, should I not cry out, should I not repeat myself over and over with an anxious heart, calling on them to abandon these fruitless musings which, just as the wind sweeps through the chicory, waft their humors without a firm standpoint on and on in a desert, where they shall encounter nothing but the mirage of empty longings—these perfidious visions in the air which depart further from the wanderer at every step. Do not nurture the wish to row on the sea of mirages and to find refreshment in its cool waves! For it is indeed impossible.

I am well aware that even the few of us, with hardly any exception, who hope to improve our conditions through an external impulse seek not a *complete upheaval*.

Nearly every member of the intelligentsia in our land has enough practical sense not to wish to sow the wind so as to avoid reaping the whirlwind again.

Any one of us has seen enough from the blood-filled scenes of the revolution to reject the delusive images of a second one.

Yet many of us now believe foreign diplomacy—which Kossuth in his terrible carelessness regarded as insignificant—will be our panacea.

They cast the anchor of their hopes upon the power of European relations.

Everything shall come right: the Trident of England, the Crescent of Istanbul, the pulpits of the German churches now turned into parliaments, shall set right our internal affairs; this is what they say, idly awaiting and yearning for such a solution like Horace's peasant *dum defluat amnis*.¹

Yet such a policy of building castles in the air can hardly have any other effect but to keep all active forces numb, to neglect the necessities of real life and to long for the plums to fall into open mouths—a longing that may whet the appetite of the indolent but can hardly satisfy it.

3, I wanted to disclose what life murmurs with a thousand voices into the unbiased ear—that great mistakes have been committed even by those who were our party leaders, some of whom have since then disappeared from the horizon for good, while others are wandering on the shores of the Hellespont, beyond the mountains of Asia Minor, in the maze of London and Paris and among the virgin forests of North America.

On the other hand, it is indisputable that within the ranks of those who have remained here one can encounter men whose bosom still cherishes the Vestal flames of patriotism and who can guard and sustain the public good by thoughts and deeds.

¹ Reference to Horace, *Epistles* (I, 2, 41): "like the rustic who waits for the river to pass along."

We have lost; but let us not lose our self-confidence.

The ravages and loss amounting to hundreds of millions, the destruction of populous towns by fire, the razing of industrious villages to the ground, the devastated forests, the pillaged granaries, the resulting lack of draft animals and means of industrial production and all the lesser and greater calamities of civil war that now bring a tear into even the most insensitive eyes will be forgotten and retrieved in a few years. But if we lose our faith in ourselves, if we begin to doubt that vigor and industriousness can make us the masters of our own fortune, if we expect a few men—who can no longer help us—to be the pledges of our future instead of the nation as it exists, the collectivity of the living and active patriots who have stayed here—oh, then we shall never repair the dreadful effects of two short years, then the arrow has hit the nation's heart and split into two her artery, for those who abandon their dignity will surely be abandoned by the gods.

Let us have confidence in our work, in our inner utilizable energies.

Let us expect and have hope of everything from our vigilance, industriousness and prudence.

Let us seek here and not elsewhere the political direction to be followed, let us not expect it from others but only from ourselves.

This is what I kept in view while writing this pamphlet, and it is with this in view that the nation should determine her future course of action.

4, My work has been chiefly concerned with the history of ideas, aiming to present succinctly but faithfully the main questions that have mobilized the Hungarian public in the last twenty-five years.

The sketch I have offered about our situation makes it obvious that our present condition is essentially different from previous ones.

We must extend our politics.

We must forget and study, but we must *remember* as well.

Those who do not *forget* will fight for prejudices and unattainable things whose days are long gone.

Those who do not *study* will be unable to choose the right area of activity and the means thereto.

Those who do not *remember* will entirely lack a historical basis in their constructions; and yet to be sure in this country with its eight-hundred-year-old constitutional tradition no one will achieve anything enduring if he totally ignores the past.

5, When I drew up an outline of the development of ideas, it was my aim to judge with unbiased severity the activities of all parties and even party factions.

Why?

I shall account for my procedure.

I wished to display how, from 1825 until the Battle of Temesvár and the capitulation at Világosvár when all roles came to an end, every party, including the conservatives, the opposition, the Centralists, the pre-February radicals, Batthyány's² majority, the fragments of moderate revolutionaries (not to mention the ultra-revolutionaries), together or one after the other, all made great slips, mistakes and misdemeanors.

None is exempt from the charges.

Mistakes were made by our adversaries and made by us as well.

It would indeed be no good to compete for the wreath of immaculacy; I mean here not the immaculacy of the heart but that of discernment.

And it would be a flagrant injustice to lay all responsibility for the consequences, whether with respect to the omissions or the things done, on the shoulders of any one party.

We have always loved our homeland; although we have often served her ill.

But on the other hand, just as some inert persons and anarchists, some obstinate and subversive men have always and every time done nothing but harm; just as history and living people will blame individuals—and may destiny grant us that the words of blame resound in the ears of our grandchildren as deterrent—: by the same token, the parties together and successively turned to reality beneficent wishes and destructed harmful aspirations. One served creation, while the other worked on sustenance. Each of them sacrificed upon the altar of the homeland in their own ways; the heavens often received favorably the sacrifices from each of them. And surely it would be a sign of great conceit from any of the parties to still try to monopolize, even now when we have mutually had ample opportunities for disillusionment, the reputation of patriotism and efficiency. None of them remained on the battleground; each party has been swept away by the tempest of the events. More or less guilty, more or less innocent... none of them are fortunate.

But after all, the Hungarian nation is still alive, and the monarchy, without whom we have no future, still survives.

So we must think about the things to be done; for pining and numbness are poor substitutes for life.

We must make the land we inhabit more beautiful, richer and mightier.

² Count Lajos Batthyány (1806–1849), the first Prime Minister of the revolutionary government in 1848.

The wounds of civil war are to be healed.

The ruins are to be cleared out and repaired.

And how much new construction is needed!

Another question is: who are the masons of the future?

Who shall help this poor, defaced country?

Who shall get us out of our complications and lead us straight to our goals?

Who shall help us become a useful complementary part of the empire and a flourishing country?

This requires the mutual co-operation of all the forces within the empire.

And as for our land?

As for our country, we need none of the parties – exclusively.

We have not diminished in numbers, we have not changed in our conditions just to let ourselves, fragmentary as we are, be split into even smaller fragments by the same old animosities.

The homeland needs no anarchists, doctrinaire revolutionaries, rotten individuals and men clasping their hands over each other.

But, since the objects of the party feuds have mostly disappeared anyway, the homeland does require of every man of ability, every usable authority of the parties among the sensible and decent politicians from the whole country that they work together in co-operation.

And what are the fundamental points of this work?

a, to promote the interests of Hungary as a national party;

b, to realize, within the necessary limitations, the imperial unity without which Austria cannot be a great power, and which is a vital requisite of our survival, not only because of the March Constitution³ but also because of the irrevocable nature of things.

c, to shield the fundamentals of society from the invasion of destructive European tendencies threatening it in its most basic components; for the triumph of a Socialist uprising would elsewhere endanger the development of the bourgeoisie, public institutions and property, while here it would threaten the very existence of the Hungarian nation as well.

This is the conclusion of the present pamphlet. [...].

Translated by Dávid Oláh

³ The 'Olmütz Constitution' of 1849, which sought to secure the unity of the Empire by a radical administrative reorganization.

NICOLAE BĂLCESCU: THE COURSE OF REVOLUTION IN THE HISTORY OF THE ROMANIANS

Title: *Mersul revoluției în istoria Românilor* (The course of revolution in the history of the Romanians)

Originally published: In the journal *România viitoare* (Paris, 16 September 1850), vol. I.

Language: Romanian

The excerpts used are from Nicolae Bălcescu, *Opere*, vol I/2 (Scrieri istorice, politice și economice), ed. by G. Zane (Bucharest: Fundația pentru literatură și artă 'Regele Carol II,' 1940), pp. 99–101, 103–108.

About the author

Nicolae Bălcescu [1819, Bucharest – 1852, Palermo]: historian, publicist and politician. His family belonged to the petty nobility, and he studied at the prestigious St. Sava College. In 1840 he participated in a plot against the ruling prince of Wallachia, Alexandru II Ghica (r. 1834–1842), but was caught and sentenced to two years in prison. In 1843 Bălcescu, together with Ion Ghica (1817–1897) and Christian Tell (1808–1884), founded a revolutionary organization named *Frația* (Brotherhood). In 1844 he began publishing historical studies, and between 1845 and 1848, together with August Treboniu Laurian (1810–1881), he edited the journal *Magazin istoric pentru Dacia* (Historical Magazine for Dacia). In 1848, after having participated in the revolution in Paris, Bălcescu returned to Wallachia. He was one of the most active participants in the revolution that broke out in Bucharest in June 1848, and became minister and secretary of state of the provisional government. Bălcescu was part of a radical group of Romanian revolutionaries who advocated land reform, the introduction of universal suffrage and military resistance against the Ottoman troops. After the defeat of the revolution in Wallachia, Bălcescu went to Transylvania, hoping to facilitate a compromise between **Lajos Kossuth** (1802–1894) and Avram Iancu (1824–1872), the leaders of the Hungarian and Transylvanian Romanian revolutions. In 1849, being in a very precarious state of health, he fled to Italy. He died alone in Palermo. In addition to his contribution to the development of Romanian historiography, Bălcescu was used by liberal movements that claimed the legacy of the revolution of 1848, and by nationalists who depicted him as a forerunner of the 'union' of Transylvania with Moldavia and Wallachia.

Main works: *Puterea armată și arta militară de la întemeierea principatului Valachiei pînă acum* (Military power and military art from the foundation of the

Principality of Wallachia up to now) (1844); *Filosofie socială* (Social philosophy) (1846); *Drepturile românilor către Înalta Poartă* (The rights of the Romanians presented to the Porte) (1848); *Mersul revoluției în istoria Românilor* (The course of revolution in the history of the Romanians) (1850); *Istoria românilor subț Mihai-Vodă Viteazul* (The History of the Romanians under Michael the Brave) (published posthumously by Al. Odobescu in 1878).

Context

The revolution of 1848 in Wallachia was better planned than the one in Moldavia. In June 1848 a committee of intellectuals, liberal boyars and sympathetic army commanders placed deputies in various towns so that the uprising might begin in several places at once. They issued a revolutionary proclamation, 'Proclamation of Izlaz,' which outlined their main political and social demands. These demands dealt with four issues: civil liberties; internal political changes; social and economic reforms; and independence from foreign rule. The revolution soon escalated in Bucharest, and Prince Gheorghe Bibescu (r. 1842–1848) was forced to accept a new constitution before fleeing to Transylvania. In the new situation the revolutionaries created a provisional government (*guvern provizoriu*) and adopted a new constitution. Its provisions included freedom of the press; equal civil rights before the law; the abolition of the feudal privileges of the boyars; internal legislative and administrative autonomy; a government responsible to a representative assembly; the widening of the franchise; and a solution to the peasant problem. The revolutionary regime asked for the unification of Moldavia and Wallachia but did not demand formal independence from the Ottoman Empire.

The social and economic reforms advocated by the revolutionary government antagonized the boyars who would not consent to the loss of their political power. Moreover, the international situation was not entirely favorable to the demands put forward by the revolutionaries, as the Great Powers were unwilling to approve complete independence for the Romanians. Eventually, after repeated debates in the 'Divans,' the boyars accepted the introduction of civil liberties. The franchise for elections to a national Constituent Assembly was expanded to include all free male Romanians aged 21 or over, who lived in towns (in other words, the peasants remained without the vote). Moreover, there was no income qualification. Voters would elect delegates to county assemblies, from whose ranks the actual assembly delegates would be elected. Thus, many Romanians would have had some kind of vote, but the

two-tiered process guaranteed that only prominent notables would make it to the constituent assembly.

Reform of the situation of the peasants was one of the most delicate issues facing the revolutionary government. A committee of boyars and peasants led by Nicolae Bălcescu was entrusted with elaborating a reform proposal. The committee agreed in principle that peasants should receive property titles in return for compensation given to landlords, but it could not agree on how much land should be given to the peasants. As the social and political problems mounted, conflicts of interests emerged within the revolutionary government. The situation worsened when the Ottoman government refused to endorse the revolutionary government and condemned the revolution. When a Romanian delegation submitted the new constitution to the sultan's approval in August 1848, he refused to accept it. A Turkish army was already camped in Wallachia; it was joined in September by a Russian force, and units from both powers then marched into Bucharest and crushed the revolutionary resistance. A new regime of the Danubian principalities was instituted according to the convention of Balta-Liman (1849). Revolutionary reforms were annulled; the power of the boyars was reduced; and the princes were henceforth to be appointed by the sultan and then approved by Russia.

Bălcescu was both an active revolutionary politician and an ideologue. With *Mersul revoluției în istoria Românilor*, a text he wrote in exile, he hoped to offer an apology of the Romanian revolution. His ambition was to create a genealogy of the idea of the revolution whose origins were to be found in the history of the Romanians. He was critical of the view that described the revolution in the Danubian Principalities and Transylvania as a mere reflection of the revolutions in Paris or Vienna. Instead, Bălcescu argued, the history of the Romanians testified to their revolutionary spirit and love of liberty. By viewing the revolutions in Moldavia, Wallachia and Transylvania as parts of the same phenomenon, he also depicted the history of the Romanians from these three countries as belonging to the same national tradition. Study of the idea of revolution was thus necessary to explaining the proper course of national evolution. Revolution nurtured the national spirit and determined, Bălcescu believed, the special mission Romanians had to accomplish in the world.

Bălcescu's discussion of Romanian national identity was based on the argument that the Romanians had enjoyed sovereignty in the past and had defended it heroically. The medieval princes of Wallachia and Moldavia, especially Michael the Brave (r. 1593–1601), were depicted as glorious defenders of the Romanian national tradition. Like other contemporary com-

mentators, Bălcescu also analyzed the Phanariot period and the role it played in Romanian history. However, contrary to the prevailing opinion, Bălcescu offered a balanced view of the Phanariots' contribution to the enlightening of the Romanian people, stressing both the negative and positive aspects of their rule.

In Bălcescu's account, historical periods and national events were united in a teleological scheme which sought to make the idea of revolution as understandable as possible. According to Bălcescu, the Romanians had passed through various stages of revolutionary activity which corresponded to the internal evolution of Romanian society. He thus named Tudor Vladimirescu's revolt of 1821 a 'democratic' revolution, since it claimed equality and freedom for the Romanians. In 1848, the Romanians revolted for social rights, for economic independence and progress. It was thus a 'social' revolution. It was only after these two major conditions, social and economic rights, were achieved that the Romanians could prepare their 'national' revolution. Bălcescu did not deny the national element altogether. The revolution of 1848 was the perfect symbol of the idea of national unification. It represented the idea of national unity and self-reliance the Romanians needed to achieve if they were to be liberated from the domination of foreign powers. Bălcescu urged the Romanians to repeat what history had already shown was possible: the attainment of national unity and the consciousness of their national identity. Revolution was thus portrayed as both progressive and a return to the national traditions. It was the historical subject which defined the particular conditions of the Romanian lands: their glorious history, their constant struggle against the foreign oppressor, and their love of freedom—along with the universal aspiration for liberty, fraternity and brotherly love among nations.

The liberal tradition of the late nineteenth century often made use of Bălcescu's ideas about the relationship between revolution and democracy. Moreover, those who viewed the history of the Romanian nation-state from a teleological perspective repeatedly invoked his definition of the national revolution, which was based on the democratic and the social achievements of 1821 and 1848, respectively. This interpretation thus viewed the Union of Transylvania with Romania in 1918 as the national revolution prophesied by Bălcescu. During the communist era Bălcescu was included in the gallery of national heroes and 'teachers' of the nation. Ultimately, he was reduced to a nationalist visionary whose only contribution was the idea of Romanian unity as described in his book on Michael the Brave. However, there were also attempts at a critical reception of his ideas. He was catalogued as a social and

political philosopher attuned to the political idealism of the time, yet original in his efforts to integrate the Romanian idea of revolution into the general European thinking about revolutionary change.

MT

The course of revolution in the history of the Romanians

The Romanian revolution of 1848 was not a disorderly, ephemeral phenomenon, with no past and future, with no other cause but the accidental will of a minority or a general European movement. The general revolution constituted the opportunity for, not the cause of, the Romanian Revolution. Its cause goes back centuries.

It was fomented by eighteen centuries of toil, suffering and effort by the Romanian people upon itself. It was a phase, a natural, necessary, foreseen historical evolution of the providential movement that takes the Romanian nation, together with all of mankind, on the infinite path of progressive, regular development, towards the highest goal that God hides from us and where He awaits us.

Let us open up History—the confession book of centuries—and enlightened by its philosophy, we will see that for eighteen centuries the Romanian nation has not been merely existing, fixed on the spot, but it has been moving forward, changing and fighting ceaselessly for the triumph of good over evil, of spirit over matter, of rights over force, for the accomplishment, both within and through all of mankind, of justice and brotherhood, those two essential pillars of absolute and perfect order, of God's order.

We will see the Romanian nation barely emerging from the storm of the barbarians' attacks—who had been haunting it for centuries and transforming it, together with the entire world—seeking to achieve its complete unity and organize itself after the principle of equality. However, the rulers, representatives of the principle of authority, gradually seized absolute power and made the monarchic principle the dominant one. [As] representatives of the state, [they] redeemed the country from anarchy and its enemies from outside, tried to preserve the Romanians in their rights as a strong independent nation, gave them dignity and power to carry out their mission in the world—to defend Christianity and the emerging civilization—but [at the same time, they] suppressed heavily freedom inside [the country]. [...]

The nation is degraded through serfdom and poverty, just as the boyars are through wealth and oppression. The country is weakened, and the Turks use

the opportunity to run it down and deprive the people of their rights. The entire society is then built on a chain of classes and individuals, each with its own privilege. A large and monstrous superstructure of tyrants, laid one on top of the other, and all relying on the people, on the hard-working peasant. Who will crush this tyranny? Who will destroy this class of the self-elected, who have come out of the people, enslaved their brothers and parents, and mocked mankind? Look, the conquerors of the people are coming. They are slaves themselves and so that the punishment [of the people] and [its] shame become greater, [the conquerors] are foreign slaves.

The coming to power of the Phanariots coincided with the rise of urban life in Western Europe. To the Romanians' misfortune, though, these city-dwellers were corrupt, foreign and inimical. They had an easy time cheating the people, luring them with talk about freedom and revenge on the boyars that had been harassing them, and after a century of struggle the boyars fell crushed, and the state turned into a Phanariot one.

A century of oppression and robbery, of corruption and degradation, of weakness and decline of nationality begins for the Romanians; an epoch of expiation, which the people have to endure under the laws of God and the spirit. But one of the conditions of human development is that progress not only breeds progress, but often from evil comes good. Thus, the Phanariots, without their knowledge or intention, accomplish a providential mission and foster progress. They revolutionize the Romanian countries completely; the political constitution of the Middle Ages with their privileges and tyranny is crushed. It is true that Mavrocordat's¹ constitution, which supersedes it, is not better; its goal is rather fiscal. But it regulates certain branches of the state; it does away with the liberties of the boyars and concentrates power in the hands of the Phanariots, who in a short time crush the old military and feudal aristocracy of the country completely. The boyars die dreadful deaths, they are exiled to foreign countries forever, or are ruined and enter the class of peasants, from which they emerged to torture and exploit their brothers. A class of bureaucrats, called '*ciocoi*' by the people, with no background or roots in the country, corrupt and degraded, rises beside the Phanariots in lieu of the fallen boyars. At the same time, serfdom is also done away with, and peasants are declared free by rights, but are not yet in fact, for they are not

¹ Constantin Mavrocordat (Constantinos Mavrocordatos) was the Phanariot prince of Wallachia and Moldavia, ruling for a number of times from the 1730s to the 1760s, who introduced a number of enlightened reforms, including a decree on the liberation of serfs.

granted liberty by being given land, and thus remain a proletariat. Eventually, national feeling, which had declined so much in the seventeenth century, is fed through persecution and gains new force; and when the evil reaches its acme, when the people, stripped of all it possessed, has no more to give, when the Phanariots' mission of crushing the old order has been accomplished, a new athlete, who has seemed to be sleeping, awakens and makes his appearance in the arena. The people has risen, great, powerful and frightening, and has swept the Phanariots out of the country.

This awakening of the people had been prepared in part by the work that came out of the mountains of learned Transylvania, an old refuge of Romanian nationality. For at that time our brothers across the Carpathians, needing to rid themselves of the domination of an aristocracy much more dreaded because it was of foreign nature, stepped out quickly on the path of progress through the works of the erudite and through insurrection, that legitimate resort of tortured peoples. [...]

The national and patriotic spirit gained more power after the revolution of 1821 and through the stabilization of a more national government than in the past, and while the party of '*ciocoi*' with the new party of the Phanariots, re-established after 1830, disputed their supremacy and rivalled each other in their zeal and flattery towards Russia, a young national party emerged and set as its mission to pursue the program of the revolution of 1821 and to achieve in all respects the wishes and needs of the people, fighting '*ciocoism*' and Phanariotism, and raising 'Romanianism' to power. As in 1821, the revolutionary party wanted to save the people through the people, and therefore it was a revolutionary party. It was not numerous, but it was young and fiery, and it knew that the truth and the future were on its side, and many people, in the bottom of their hearts, felt and thought like this party, and when its flag was raised, it would be surrounded by a lot of prozelytes. Impatient to get to work, [the revolutionary party] was tempted in 1840 to prelude a movement, but the time was not ripe yet, and it achieved nothing but scratching a few more names on the list of the martyrs of Romanian liberty. Since then it has confined its activities to the secret and open propaganda of ideas in literary writings, and has sought to prepare the future revolution and formulate its synthesis. The ideas and interests of the people had changed and the long-awaited revolution could not limit itself to the platform of 1821. Now, it was not enough to want the state to become Romanian, for the issue of the people's poverty also had to be resolved; property, the basis of society, of public wealth and happiness had to be given a new organization. Crushing the regulation [i.e., the 'Organic Regulations'] that monopolized the state, the owner-

ship of land and capital in the hands of the '*ciocoi*,' it was all absolutely necessary to proclaim the democratization of the state by equality of rights, of the land, by giving it to the peasants, and of capital, by credit institutions organized by the state; hence the need to accomplish a democratic and social revolution. Such was the program of the revolution of 1848. [...]

The people changes from *slave* to serf, then *proletar*, then *possessor* and now it throws away the last form of exploitation and becomes *proprietor*. And each one of these successive transformations was a form of progress as compared to the previous state, and all in all has led to progress.

The revolution of 1848 tried to restore the Romanians to their rights as humans and citizens, without seeking to reset them in their rights as a nation. To this end, it was confined to asking Turkey to abide by the old capitulation also recognized and reinforced through the Treaty of Adrianopole and the 'Hatt-i Şerif' of 1834. [The revolution] also demanded that Russia should abide by the treaties that recognize the administrative autonomy and independence of the country, and the non-violation of land, and [she should] limit herself to her role as guarantor, without interfering in the country's domestic affairs and abusing her protective role. The revolution of 1848 was, therefore, not against Turkey or Russia, since it was confined to asking abidance by the treaties, without demanding new rights. [...]

These conditions of power that we need cannot be found elsewhere but in the solidarity of all Romanians, in their unity in one nation; a unification that is meant for them through their nationality, through the same language, religion, customs, feelings, geographic position, through their past, and eventually through the need to preserve themselves and be redeemed.

If nationality is the soul of a people, if as long as it preserves this distinguishing sign of its individuality—this spirit of life—it is invested with the unalienable right to live in freedom, then national unity is the guarantee of its liberty; it is its necessary body so that the soul does not disappear and it does not become numb, but on the contrary it can grow and develop.

National unity has been the dear dream of our brave leaders, of all our great men who embodied the individuality and thinking of the people to show it to the world. For it, these men lived, worked, suffered and died. [...]

It is time now, when nationality and political existence are denied to us, when we see that especially since 1848 the words *unity* and *nationality* have been uttered by all Europeans, the feeling has been in everyone's heart, all the people have been armed, shed blood, so much blood in these last two years, blood that will be flowing until the map of Europe is redrawn; the states based on conquest, on violating the rights of nations are crushed, the

nations are reunited in liberty and the sacred alliance of people is accomplished. [...] It is time, I say, that the Romanian nation raised the flag of its unity, the flag of the past greatness and bravery of our parents, the flag of Mircea, Stephen and Michael,² the flag of life and redemption. [...] 'Pan-Romanianism' must be today our common goal. Through it we complete our revolutionary synthesis.

The revolution of 1821 asked for justice, and wanted all Romanians to be free and equal, the state to be Romanian. It was a democratic revolution.

The revolution of 1848 wanted the Romanians not only to be free, but also to have the right to property, without which liberty and equality are lies. To this end, it added the word 'brotherhood,' that major condition for social progress. It was a social revolution.

The next revolution cannot be confined to asking the Romanians to be free, equal, owners of land and capital, and brothers associated to achieve the jointly desired progress. It will not possibly be limited to seeking liberty from within, which is impossible to achieve without having freedom from outside, freedom from foreign domination, but it will ask for national unity and liberty. Its slogan will be: *justice, brotherhood, unity*. It will be a national revolution.

This is the way the Romanian revolution will pursue its course in the future. And only when the sacred war will free the nation from the oppression of foreigners and reunify it in liberty and unity, will the congress of people, the Constituent Assembly, be able to achieve in peace all the political and social reforms needed and to establish the dominance of democracy, the rule of the people by the people.

To create a nation! A nation of brothers, of free citizens, this is, O Romanians, the sacred and great deed that God has trusted us with. In vain will you kneel and pray at the gates of emperors or at the doors of their ministers; they will give you nothing, for they cannot and do not wish to. Be ready, then, to take what you wish, because the emperors, the lords and the boyars of the land will not give [anything away] except what peoples seize for themselves. Be ready, then, to fight like men, for through fight and sacrifice, through the blood you shed, the people gains awareness of rights and responsibilities. The day of victory, the day of justice is coming, when the people will rise to sweep away the remaining tyrants from the face of the earth. Then you will

² Mircea the Old, Prince of Wallachia (r. 1386–1418); Stephen the Great, Prince of Moldavia (r. 1457–1504); Michael the Brave, Prince of Wallachia (r. 1593–1601) the most important Romanian rulers of the late medieval period.

rise and start the national fight, the fight of redemption. Then you will not be on your own facing the enemy, but all the peoples of Europe will rush to help you and will stand beside you, for now all have felt that they have the same enemy, and that together, united, they must fight against it. You will have the fortune and glory to face it first, to be the vanguard of civilization against barbarity, as in the Middle Ages, but then the laurels that you gain will grow in your hand and shade the universe. [...] Bravery and faith, Romanian brothers! God in heaven and mankind on earth are working for us!

Translated by Mária Kovács

HRISTO BOTEV: HADJI DIMITER, THE HANGING OF VASIL LEVSKI

Title: *Хаджи Димитър* (Hadji Dimiter); *Обесване на Васил Левски* (The hanging of Vasil Levski)

Originally published: 'Hadji Dimiter' in *Независимост*, III, 47, (11 July 1873). 'The Hanging of Vasil Levski' in *Календар за година 1876* (Calendar for the year 1876), published by Hristo Botev in Romania.

Language: Bulgarian

Edition used: *Hristo Botev. Poems*, translated by Kevin Ireland (Sofia: Sofia Press, 1982).

About the author

Hristo Botev [1848, Kalofer (Balkan valley) – 1876, near Vratsa (north-western Bulgaria)]: poet, journalist and revolutionary leader. He was born into the family of the teacher Botio Petkov, one of the figures of the 'National Revival.' His birthplace, Kalofer, was one of the most vital centers of the Balkan valley, which occupies a central place in the political and cultural revival movement (see **Ivan Vazov**, *Under the Yoke*). After completing primary school in his hometown, Botev continued his education in Odessa. In 1865 he left school, and returning in 1867 to Kalofer he succeeded his father as teacher in the local school. However, because of his revolutionary activities he had to leave Bulgaria and settle in Romania (first in Bucharest, then in Br ila), where he took an active part in the affairs of the Bulgarian revolutionary émigré community. These centered around the Bulgarian Revolutionary Central Committee (BRCC), led by his close ally Liuben Karavelov, and the newspaper *Zname* ('The Flag'), which Botev edited, became the main organ of the revolutionary party. After the uprising of April 1876, he organized a detachment of armed volunteers and crossed the Danube on the 16th of May. He was killed on the 20th of May, in the evening after the battle, while on sentry duty in the camp. His literary work was influenced by Byron, Pushkin and, especially, Lermontov. In his poems (of which he composed only twenty) he integrated motifs from Bulgarian folklore, and thus, according to his apologists, he created the quintessential expression of 'Bulgarian cosmogony.' He was politically on the left, his position bordering on communism and anarchism. His political journalism was extremely sharp, and highly literary, putting it on a level with canonized poems such as 'Hadji Dimiter' or 'The hanging of Vasil Levski.' In 1885 a committee was founded for the commemoration of the anniversary of the poet's death. A monument to Botev was unveiled in 1890, in the presence of King Ferdinand, on the main square of Vratsa, where the first of such commemo-

rations took place. Some of the most influential political leaders of the newly founded Bulgarian state, such as Zahari Stoyanov and Stefan Stambolov, significantly contributed to his mythification, and within a decade Botev became a central figure in the national pantheon of the independent Bulgarian state.

Main works: *Песни и стихотворения от Ботйова и Стамболова. Книжка първа* [Songs and poems by Botev and Stambolov. Book I] (1875).

Context

Revolutionary poetry, one of the most influential and popular genres in the nineteenth century, stimulated the feeling of national belonging in the period of ‘national revivals’ in Southeast Europe. The genre of the revolutionary poem, emblematic for Bulgarian Romanticism, drew on the tradition of ‘heroic’ folksongs. The relationship between folksongs and poetry was double-sided. On the one hand, Bulgarian Romantic poets exploited folkloric material (on a thematic and rhetoric level, and on the level of versification as well), as a result of which the genre of revolutionary poetry was situated between high literature and popular culture. On the other hand, being addressed to the broadest possible public, the revolutionary poems themselves were very often transformed into quasi-folksongs. Thus, Dobri Chintulov’s revolutionary songs, for instance, were sung to folk tunes. Undoubtedly, they were the most popular Bulgarian ‘texts’ of the period before the creation of an independent Bulgarian state, mostly due to their oral form which made it possible for the majority of the population, which was illiterate, to come in contact with them. Similarly, poems by Liuben Karavelov, Botev and Stefan Stambolov were sung and together with Chintulov’s poems became informal anthems of the revolutionary movement and particularly of the ‘April Uprising’ in 1876. On the other hand, Romanticism formed the horizon of reception for folklore, not only as an artistic phenomenon but also as a *national oeuvre* (see **Dimitar Marinov**, *Living antiquity*).

Revolutionary poetry had very clear and concrete political implications. It promoted the ideology of the radical revolutionary wing of the Bulgarian national movement, the center of which was in Romania, where the headquarters of the BRCC had also moved, following the destruction of the network of revolutionary committees created by Vasil Levski. It was also in Romania that the main newspapers of the revolutionary party were published (Karavelov’s ‘Svoboda’ and ‘Nezavisimost’ and Botev’s ‘Duma’ and ‘Zname’); whereas the newspapers of the moderate, ‘evolutionist’ and dualist circles were based in Constantinople (see **Hristo Botev**, *The People*).

The poems 'Hadji Dimiter' and 'The hanging of Vasil Levski' have a similar structure, and portray the death of two of the principal heroes of the national movement. Vasil Levski, the incontestable and later 'canonized' leader of the revolutionary movement in Bulgaria, was arrested and hanged by the Turks in 1873; while Hadji Dimiter was, together with Stefan Karadja, leader of a revolutionary detachment (*cheta*) which crossed the Danube from Romania in the summer of 1868, the two leaders dying soon after. That was practically the end of the *guerilla* tactics of the émigré revolutionary circles. The poem, 'Hadji Dimiter,' became a legitimating myth of the Bulgarian national canon as the mythological aura of the hero of the poem was projected onto Botev himself.

Both poems have a similar underlying arch-text, or arch-figure—the outstanding individual. They express the mythical archetype of the Romantic Hero. Such a hero, while opposed to the profane 'mass' of people, is at the same time the quintessential incarnation of the community. The inherent logic of the two poems is thus based on the following structural *double bind*: the immortality of the hero is guaranteed by the eternal admiration of the grateful people, but, on the other hand, the existence of community itself is secured by its transcendental guarantor, the national hero.

BM

Hadji Dimiter

He lives, still he lives! In the mountain fast,
soaked in blood, he lies and groans,
a rebel, wounded in the chest,
a rebel, young and with a manly strength.

To one side he has thrown a gun,
to the other a sword in broken pieces,
his head rolls, his eyes are dulled,
his mouth describes the universe with curses.

The rebel lies, and in the sky
there burns a motionless and angry sun;
a harvester sings in fields near by,
and faster still his lifeblood runs.

It's harvest now. Slave girls – chant
your songs of grief. And you, sun, shine
upon this land of slaves. My heart
be hushed. One rebel more will die.

He who falls while fighting to be free
can never die: for him the sky
and earth, the trees and beasts shall keen,
to him the minstrel's song shall rise...

By day he's shaded by an eagle,
a wolf licks gently at his wounds,
above, a falcon – bird of rebels –
tends to this rebel as a brother would.

The moon comes out and day grows dim,
on heaven's vault the stars now throng,
the forest rustles, quiet stirs the wind,
the mountains sing an outlaw song.

Wood-sprites, in their white-hued dress,
fair and beautiful, take up the tune,
hushed their footfall in the grass,
as all about him then sit down.

One sprinkles coolness over him,
another binds his wound with herbs,
a third's quick kisses touch his lips
and softly smiles as he looks up at her.

Where is Karadja? – sister, say.
Where is my faithful company?
Tell me, then bear my soul away –
sister, this is where I want to die.

Enraptured then they all embrace
and heavenwards fly, still singing on
they fly and sing till morning overtakes
their quest to find Karadja's soul...

On the mountainside – as day has dawned –
the rebel lies, his lifeblood runs,
the wolf licks at his bitter wound
and the sun, again, now burns – and burns.

Translated by Kevin Ireland

The Hanging of Vasil Levski

O mother mine, dear motherland,
Why do you weep so piteously?
And raven – you accursed bird –
Your grim croak sounds above whose grave?
O, I know, I know, you weep, my mother,
Because you are a wretched slave,
Because your sacred voice, my mother,
Is a voice alone in a desert waste.
Weep on. There – near the town of Sofia –
I saw a wretched gallows jut,
And one of your sons, Bulgaria,
Was hanging with a chilling force.
The raven croaks with evil omen,
Dogs and wolves howl in the fields,
The old men pray to God with fervour,
The children scream, the women wail.
The winter sings its baleful song,
Squalls chase thistles on the plain,
And cold and frost and hopeless tears
Overwhelm your heart with pain.

Translated by Kevin Ireland

TWO MACEDONIAN MANIFESTOS

1.

Title: *Манифест на Главниот штаб на македонската војска* (Manifesto of the headquarters of the Macedonian army), announced on Mount Pirin, 29 June 1880

Originally published: At the time this manifesto was distributed throughout Macedonia as a type-written text; at least in such form it is to be found in the secret archive of Patriarch Cyril of Bulgaria in the Dragalevo monastery, volume 23, p. 101–103, under the title: ‘Bulgaro-Macedonian League.’

Language: Bulgarian

Slavko Dimevski, Vlado Popovski, Svetomir Škarić, Mihajlo Apostolski, eds., *Македонската Лига и Уставот за државно уредување на Македонија од 1880* (Skopje: Мисла, 1985), pp. 326–328.

2.

Title: *Manifesto of the Temporary Government of Macedonia, 18/30 April 1881* (the source publication used does not contain the original French text)

Author of the text: It is not clear who was the actual author of the text; the manifesto is signed by the president of the temporary government, a certain Vasilos Simos, and the secretary Nikolaos Trajkos.

Originally published: The Manifesto was attached to a letter sent to the Russian diplomatic representative in Constantinople, General N. P. Ignatieff; it is now in the Central State Archive in Moscow (CGAOR, Moskva, f. 730, op. 1, No 79, l. 1).

Language: French

Документи за борбата на македонскиот народ за самостојност и национална држава, vol. 1, (Skopje: Универзитет Кирил и Методиј, 1981), pp. 267–268; also in Slavko Dimevski, Vlado Popovski, Svetomir Škarić, Mihajlo Apostolski, eds., *Македонската Лига и Уставот за државно уредување на Македонија од 1880* (Skopje: Мисла, 1985), pp. 356–357. In both editions the texts are translated into Macedonian.

About the author

Vasil Diamandiev [1839, Ohrid – 1912, Sofia]: politician. Finished primary school in Ohrid. At the age of sixteen he started teaching in his native town (1855–57). He worked as a teacher in several places in Macedonia until 1867, when, accused of being a Russian agent (he had studied in Moscow and Kiev between 1858 and 1861) he was imprisoned by the Ottoman authorities. Afterwards he moved to Russia and lived in Bessarabia. During the Eastern Crisis (1875–1878) he was very active in promoting the cause of the liberation of the Balkan peoples. After the end of the Russo-Turkish war (1877–78) he moved to the newly created Bulgaria. He continued to send petitions and memoranda proposing solutions to the Macedonian question. In the summer of 1880 he participated in the formation of the ‘Macedonian League’ in Ruse (Bulgaria) and became its president. After its hasty dissolution he continued to work in different Macedonian émigré associations and committees until the end of his life in 1912. Vasil Diamandiev does not belong to the first rate historical figures in terms of canonization. Although he is the most probable author of the Manifesto, it is the text that has been emphasized, and the organization behind it: ‘The Macedonian League.’

Context

In the nineteenth century the peoples in the Balkans realized that the situation within the Ottoman Empire would change substantially only after active intervention by the Great Powers. The international crisis connected with the Eastern Question brought hopes that the Russian armies after another victorious campaign would convince the sultan to grant autonomy to its Christian subjects—the first step towards full independence. The established pattern of (Christian) uprisings and (Turkish) retaliatory massacres leading to different forms of outside pressure, a probable war and an even more probable conference (or congress), always depended on many unpredictable factors in the mechanism of European decision-making. The dream of an eventually favorable geo-strategic decision by the cabinets of the Great Powers (the Russians being considered to be the most promising), was shared by virtually everybody in the Balkan region, from illiterate peasants through priests and traders to the various types of revolutionaries both at home and in émigré circles.

The uprising in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1875 followed by the war that Serbia and Montenegro waged on Turkey (together with the bloody events in Bulgaria) provoked a series of diplomatic crises, culminating in a major international crisis which led to another Russo-Turkish war (1877–1878). During this resurgence of the Eastern Question, the first outburst since the Cri-

mean war, the Russian army chose the shortest way to Constantinople—by following the west coast of the Black Sea—through Romania, across the Danube and then through the Bulgarian vilayets of the Ottoman Empire. In spite of putting up a staunch resistance, the Turks were almost totally expelled from the Balkans and had to sign a Russian-dictated preliminary peace treaty known as the San Stefano agreement (3 March 1878). Almost the whole geographic territory of Macedonia was to be included in the projected autonomous Bulgarian state under Russian tutelage, making this by far the biggest state in Southeast Europe. However, such radical changes to the Balkan political geography had first to be addressed by a European congress, since the San Stefano agreement manifestly ignored and endangered the interests of other countries (mainly Austria-Hungary and Great Britain). As far as Macedonia's population was concerned, the most important decision of the ensuing Berlin Congress (June 1878) was the return of this province to Ottoman rule, with a vague promise—the famous 'article 23'—of reforms in the direction of semi-autonomy. Although Macedonia had not been in the path of the Russian armies, their presence in neighboring Bulgaria heated political feelings in Macedonian towns and villages, producing turmoil amongst the ethnically and religiously mixed population. It was precisely this ethno-cultural mix that produced the various kinds of 'revolutionary' responses to the crisis of the moment. The main question was in whose name to demand autonomy for Macedonia, since the population consisting of Slavs, Greeks, Albanians, Turks, Vlachs and Jews (in contested proportions) had no homogenous political vision or aspirations. The Slavic Macedonian majority itself suffered divisions in loyalty between the Patriarchate in Constantinople with its Greek cultural values and the Exarchate, seen as the pillar of Bulgaro-Slavic resistance against the traditional Greek cultural (and economic) domination. All these dilemmas are reflected in the documents issued by two political-military bodies of the time—the 'Macedonian League' and the 'Temporary Government—Unity.'

The 'Macedonian League,' founded in 1880 in Bulgaria, demonstrated from the very start the ambiguity of its identity-platform. A number of guerilla leaders (*vojvodas*), many of them veterans of what could at best be termed 'non-revolutionary banditry,' willingly participated in every anti-Turkish war and uprising in the region but lacked the 'intellectual capital' necessary for establishing wider contacts, lobbying and formulating an authentic political program. On the other hand, the Macedonian emigrant intelligentsia, very often existentially and spiritually connected with the Bulgarian ecclesiastic and educational institutions, insisted on investing the Mace-

donian political project with a Bulgarian substance. In turn, the *vojvodas* tended to think that this would damage the Macedonian cause both internationally and internally. As a result of these disagreements the name of the league changed many times: the Bulgaro-Macedonian, the Macedono-Bulgarian, and, finally, the Macedonian League. In some ways this reflects a conflict between archaic local patriotism and one of its derivatives—modern nationalism. Such referential divisions (Macedonian/Bulgarian/Greek...) within the definition of Macedonian identity persisted long enough to be called paradigmatic. The present ‘Manifesto,’ one of the several documents issued by the Macedonian League (including a draft constitution for a projected Macedonian state) seems to indicate the dominant position of the *vojvodas* in the political leadership of the League.

The ‘Temporary Government—Unity,’ established at the same time as the League but in a different part of Macedonia (the southwestern areas close to the Greek border), had similar national and political visions as the ‘Macedonian League.’ This temporary government was elected by a secret ‘National Assembly’ held in May 1880 close to Lake Ostrovo (Vegorida). The frequent references in the Manifesto to the glory of ancient Macedonia and Alexander the Great, as well as the biographies of certain of its founders (Leonidas Vularis, for instance) reveal Hellenic influence, both official and unofficial. The most interesting aspect is the composition of the delegates who participated in this convention, representing almost all the religious and cultural identities in Macedonia: there were Albanians, Turks, Greeks, and Vlachs as well as Slavic adherents of all political orientations, that is, Serbian, Bulgarian and Greek.

Not much was known about this ‘National Assembly’ and its temporary government, and unflattering rumors circulated about its members, depicting them as being either Greek or Russian agents. However, their Manifesto bears specific identity-building accents with strong appeals to unity (addressed to all peoples of Macedonia), so different from the other programs of internal exclusion reducing Macedonia to the field of various irredentisms. It is worth mentioning that in June 1880 the representatives of the Temporary Government met with the leadership of the Macedonian League and decided to cooperate for the common cause. However, both of these committees, in spite of threats of an armed uprising, would be remembered by history only through the legacy of the documents they issued.

Bulgaria and Greece sought to avoid getting into trouble with their powerful Ottoman neighbor. Without their logistic help the revolutionary committees, situated in marginal areas, found that their armed forces quickly dis-

solved when discovered by Turkish units. Nevertheless, both the 'League' and the 'Unity' government won a respectable position within the historiographic discourse on nation-building in the Republic of Macedonia. They are considered as precursors of the very idea of an autonomous Macedonian state. Their programmatic documents are considered to be the first step in the evolution of a separate Macedonian political thinking based on civic patriotism, and not on the ideals and practices characterizing a nation-state project. Appearing in the 1980s, these documents were immediately appropriated by the national canon-builders; their civic component being considered rather as a step in the evolution of the national idea than having any intrinsic value.

NI

**Manifesto of the headquarters of the Macedonian army,
announced on Mount Pirin, 29 June 1880**

Macedonian Brothers,

For five hundred years dark and black clouds have covered the whole Macedonian people and their country. We, the wretched slaves of the Ottomans, can no longer endure all the gruesome terrible screaming of our raped mothers and sisters, of children torn away from the bosoms of their mothers. The knife has reached the bone! Nobody listens to our screams any more. Christian Europe handed over our suffering people to the arbitrariness of Turkish religious fanaticism. The last hope, centered on article 23 of the Berlin agreement, collapsed. There is nothing else left except to take up the arms with the slogan 'Death or freedom for Macedonia.'

With uneasiness in our heart we decide for this step knowing that the struggle will be hard and bloody, but we are forced to take into our hands the destiny of our fatherland. We believe no more in promises when the blood of the victims calls us to vengeance.

Macedonians,

The hour to fight against our ancient enslaver is approaching. Prepare for it as faithful sons of suffering Macedonia. Forget mutual disagreements, for we are all its sons regardless of faith and nationality. We are first and foremost Macedonians. Do not believe our neighbors who have slipped amongst us like snakes and cheat us for their own interests. Join together under the

Macedonian flag and raise it high, high in the struggle for freedom and independence. Only joined together can we keep for ourselves our beloved fatherland Macedonia and obtain our full autonomy.

Courageous Macedonian sons,

Our neighbors long to grab Macedonia for themselves, to tear it apart. Let us come together under our flag and remain only Macedonians, for only united as brothers can we free ourselves from despair under Turkish rule and remain ourselves on our land. Close your ranks and await the call for our general Macedonian uprising. With gun on shoulder and sword in hand, join our Macedonian army in the fight against the savage merciless pagans. Chase away all those who have joined with foreign interests and preach that "the sword does not cut the humble head." Respond: gun on gun, knife on knife!

We are not anymore prepared to accept other people creating our destiny, to stand before their doors and expect mercy from cruel hearts. Today we have our Macedonian army in our mountains, which might not yet be numerous, but with God's help and yours will become strong. It will fight for liberation and win a good outcome for our beautiful fatherland.

We ask you, brother Macedonians, not to take this manifesto as a mere appeal, but to prepare for our general Macedonian uprising against our eternal tyrants. We hope that all true Macedonians will hear our call to bloody struggle. So we finish our appeal with our slogan:

'Death or liberty! Long live free Macedonia.'

Headquarters of the Macedonian Army within the Macedonian League.

President:

V. Diamandiev

Main voivode: Iljo Maleshevski; Kocho voivode, village of Lakossa, Serres district; Kosta voivode from Levunovo village, Melnik; Angel voivode from Kumanich village, Nevrokop; Miledidzhik voivode from Karluhovo village, Zahna district; Stoyan voivode from Djegurovo, Melnik; Georgi voivode from Karchevo village, Demir-Hisar district; Todor voivode from Starchishta village, Nevrokop area.

Mount Pirin,
29 June 1880

**Manifesto of the Temporary Government of Macedonia,
23 March 1881**

Macedonians,

Once upon a time our dear fatherland Macedonia was one of the most glorious countries. And the Macedonian people, by building on the foundations of their military skills, with their victorious phalanxes and the wisdom of Aristotle civilized humanity and Asia. But our fatherland, once so glorious, is today at the threshold of annihilation because of our mistakes and because we have forgotten our origins. Alien and dubious peoples want to take possession of our country and destroy our nation that, shining with such a light, cannot and will not ever fall. Macedonia has become like a widow, tragically deserted by her sons. She no longer holds the flag once carried in triumph by the victorious Macedonian armies. She is today nothing more than a geographic notion. There are efforts to cover her tokens of victory with the dust of oblivion. Conspirators roaming through our country have given her deadly poisons and have dug a grave for her. These plotters are the gravediggers of the great and glorious fatherland; these are the same prisons who seek to dismember her or allow the entry of the victorious Austro-Hungarian troops. By replacing one yoke with another the regeneration of Macedonia will become impossible and our nationality will disappear. The moment is critical for Macedonia: it is about her life or death.

True Macedonians, loyal children of the fatherland!

Will you tolerate the fall of our dear country? Look at her, bound in slavery and covered by wounds made by the surrounding peoples. Look at her and behold the heavy chains put by the sultan. Powerless and weeping, our beloved Macedonia, our dear fatherland addresses you. "You my loyal children; you that are my inheritors after Aristotle and Alexander the Great; you in whose veins Macedonian blood runs, do not leave me dying, but help me. What a sorrowful sight would it be for you, true Macedonians, if you become eyewitnesses of my funeral. No, here are my terrible bloody wounds, here are my heavy chains: break them, heal my wounds; make sure that on the flag I raise will be written: Macedonia one and united! Do so boldly, chase from your country those murderers who carry the flag of discord and introduce passions of separation and divide you, my children, into countless nationalities; gathering around the flag of Macedonia, as your only national sign, raise it high up, make this glorious flag ready and then write unanimously:

Long live the Macedonian people, long live Macedonia!

The voice of our country does exist, freedom does exist—that cherished legacy of the peoples. To proclaim these words means to call the noble hearts to rush up and fight in order to help you, obtaining that sacred freedom absent from our dear fatherland for so many centuries.

Macedonians, remember our origin and do not give it up!

Kiustendil, 11/23 March 1881

Dospat, 18/30 April 1881

President Vasil Chomo (Simon)

Secretary Nikola Trajkov

Translated by Nikola Iordanovski

NAMIK KEMAL: MOTHERLAND, OR SILISTRA

Title: *Vatan yahud Silistre* (Motherland, or Silistra)

Originally published: Istanbul, n.p., 1889

Language: Ottoman Turkish

Excerpts taken from *Vatan yahud Silistre*, reprinted by the Turkish Ministry of Culture (Ankara, 1990), pp. 25–34; 44–46; 56–57; and 84–85. The play was translated into German by Leopold Pekotsch, with the title *Heimat oder Silistria* (Vienna, 1887).

About the author

See **Namık Kemal**, *Ottoman History*, pp. 94.

Context

This play, seminal in the propagation of an Ottomanist national consciousness among the wider Ottoman populace, was written and performed at a time when the Balkan provinces of the Empire were simmering with revolt. *Vatan* is set at the time of the Crimean War (1853–56), and narrates the story of a group of Muslim Ottoman civilians who volunteer to join the army in defense of the castle of Silistra (now in northern Bulgaria) that was besieged by the Russian army. It must be noted that the evocation of the Crimean War, and in particular the siege of Silistra (1854), played a significant role in enhancing the play's emotional impact, since, in public memory, it represented the only palpable victory gained by the Ottoman army in the recent past.

While espousing patriotic zeal in its fiery sentimentalism, Namık Kemal's epic on the defense of the Ottoman motherland is also redolent of the rising Islamic sentiment of the 1870s. With the relative freedom allowed during the initial years of the reign of Abdülaziz (1861–1876), Ottoman intellectuals of various tendencies gained the opportunity to voice shared

anxieties and demands arising from the rich social ferment of the Late *Tanzimat* (see **Ahmed Midhat Efendi**, *The basis of reform*). The tenor of the public debate, however, was largely dictated by the rising sentiments of the historically dominant and privileged Muslim population. In the wake of the 1856 Reform Edict, which re-affirmed the state's commitment to institutional reforms based on European models and sanctioned the rights given to the non-Muslim communities, the critical discourse on the reform agenda of the *Tanzimat* was suffused with an unmistakably conservative and traditionalist mood. Vexed by the indefinite prospects of economic integration with Europe, several members of the burgeoning intelligentsia (from men on the fringes of the constitutionalist movement to more xenophobic ultra-conservatives) called for a re-examination of the impact of the *Tanzimat* program at large. Prompted by the new and multi-layered debate on the future of the *Tanzimat*, those in charge of the official reform policy also realized the urgency of being more responsive to the changing realities of Ottoman society (especially those of the dissatisfied Muslim populace). They believed that it was time to refurbish *Tanzimat* 'Ottomanism' as a coherent ideology with a wider popular basis. Thus, while the state retained the rhetoric of international cosmopolitanism it inherited from the founders of the *Tanzimat*, the weight of Islam as a basis of legitimacy became more accentuated within the everyday official discourse of the Abdülaziz era (as observed in the new emphasis placed on the title "caliph" by the sultan himself). In sum, in an attempt to procure the political commitment of the Muslim masses, the reformist strategy of the *Tanzimat* was realigned with reference to the rising conservative mood in the public psyche.

Namık Kemal's treatment of the term '*vatan*' clearly evinces the fundamental flaw in the configuration of a common sense of Ottoman patriotism during the Late *Tanzimat*. While, in theory, the novel Ottoman notion of *patrie* demanded the allegiance of all ethno-religious elements in the empire, the sentiments that actually went into the making of the idea perceptibly appealed to the dominant Muslim community. Throughout his literary and scholarly works, Namık Kemal weaves an emotional aura around the concept of *vatan* as a sacred domain that was drenched in the blood of the Ottoman martyrs. It was impossible for non-Muslim Ottomans to project themselves into the national-dynastic mythology conjured up by Kemal. In his historical writings, he recounts the story of the fatherland, in romantic grandiloquence, by evoking the glories of the Ottoman conquests and the valiance of the sultan's armies. In Namık Kemal's grand narrative of Ottoman splendor, all heroic deeds are fulfilled in the name of the dynasty and of Islam. It is no coin-

cidence, therefore, that the most heroic figure in the play *Vatan* is named Islam Bey, and that the volunteers in the Silistra castle are invariably Muslim subjects.

In terms of its literary merits, *Vatan* ranks low among Namık Kemal's other novels and dramas. The play's historic significance, however, is immense, as it represents the first dramatic expression of the love of motherland in the Ottoman cultural realm. An instant success, *Vatan* proved Namık Kemal's contention that theater was not merely a means to educate the common people on morals, as perceived by the earlier Ottoman playwrights, but a powerful tool for the propagation of ideas as well as for the mobilization of the masses. With its intense emotional charge, *Vatan* aroused the strong defensive sentiments of the Ottoman public, long beleaguered by an atmosphere of crisis and vulnerability that loomed large over the troubled empire. Following the play's debut on 1 April 1873, an overenthusiastic crowd took to the streets, shouting patriotic slogans. The demonstration soon changed course though, as political slogans were heard in support of Murad V, the heir apparent who was favored by the constitutionalists for his liberal inclinations. The public stir caused by the play's consecutive performances alarmed the government about the rising popular sway of the Young Ottoman opposition. The performances were cancelled, and Namık Kemal was arrested and exiled to Cyprus. The exile of other intellectuals and journalists affiliated with the Young Ottoman circles followed. The arrests marked the beginning of a new period of intense government surveillance on all media of public communication in the Ottoman Empire. Still, *Vatan* remained embedded in public memory as an outstanding symbol of patriotic action. Following the 1908 revolution, amidst the popular euphoria over the advent of 'freedom,' *Vatan* was restaged several times in Istanbul and Thessaloniki theaters.

AE

Motherland, or Silistra

[from ACT I]

As the curtains are drawn, a room facing the street becomes visible. Zekiye, wearing a proper lady's costume special to Albania, is lying on a cushion with a book in her hand, and a candle in front of her. ... Suddenly, [her lover] Islam Bey enters the room through the window, and reveals his decision to join the army in defending his homeland. His lover is perplexed.

[...]

ZEKIYE: ... If you really love me, then why should we part?

ISLAM BEY: I must go...

[...]

ZEKIYE: (running towards Islam Bey, interrupting him) Then kill me first.

ISLAM BEY: (unmoved) I will go ... I will go, even if my path is surmounted by the flames of hell. I will go, even if the angel of death thrusts his claws into my chest. I will go, even if I must step on my father's grave with my own feet. Even if my grandmother's body is to be crushed under my feet, I will go. Knowing you will die for me, I will go again.

ZEKIYE: (walking anxiously, talking to herself in an audible voice) Oh! He does not believe... he does not believe that I will die for him. Maybe he will not even believe me when I die. (turning towards him) You will go... You will go... Why?

ISLAM BEY: (determined) On holy nights, you visit the cemetery, don't you?

ZEKIYE: (irritably) I do... So?

ISLAM BEY: Have you not seen my ancestors lying there? I know the names of forty two martyrs from my lineage, but I have not yet heard of one man who died peacefully in his bed. You see? Not one man... Today, the state has declared war. The enemy is determined to trample our martyrs' bones under their feet. The enemy points his gun towards my motherland and my bare chest is not standing in front of it... Is this possible? Should I sit comfortably in my home while the motherland is in danger? Should I stand still while the entire motherland is trembling? How is it possible for me to be solely absorbed in your love, when today, the love of the motherland must be holier than all? Shall I not live up to the promise of my father and my ancestors while our entire world is in disarray? Motherland... Motherland... The motherland is in danger, I say. Do you hear me? God created me, and the motherland brought me up. God feeds me, and He feeds me [to serve] the motherland. I was hungry when I came out from my mother's womb. It was the motherland that nourished me. I was stark naked, and it was the motherland that dressed me up. The motherland's blessing resides in my very bones. My body is of the motherland's earth, my breath of the motherland's air. Why was I born if not to die for my motherland? Aren't I a man? Don't I have a duty? Shouldn't I love my country? Oh, how can you hope for love from a man who does not love his country?

ZEKIYE: If... Motherland... When it's the motherland... I... What should I say... I... What can I say? Go! Go Bey! I guess this was meant to happen. I

know the motherland. I have heard about her. But I never thought she could tear two hearts apart. Apparently she can. She tore my heart. I am still bleeding inside ... Let it bleed as much as it wants. Go Bey! At most I shall shed a tear or two. If you do not let me, I won't even do that, but keep them in my heart, and let each one turn into a drop of poison. You are going to war, aren't you? Are you not going for your motherland? Then forget me, and the whole world too... I... I won't even expect a letter. I hope to God you come back safe and sound. Then, here, you will find your slave waiting for you. [...]

[from ACT II]

When the curtains are drawn, volunteers in one bastion of the Silistra Castle are sitting here and there. Zekiye stands within the group wearing men's clothes.

[Colonel Sidki Bey enters]

[...]

SIDKI BEY: Those who want to stay in the castle, step aside.

A VOLUNTEER: Well, we all came here because we want to stay. Why should we leave?

SIDKI BEY: Aghas! The enemy has crossed the Danube. There are skirmishes at the other end of the city. It seems our homeland is going to be entirely besieged within a couple of days. [But], may God show no misfortune, the state is capable of defending her castle with her own soldiers. Those among you who do not wish to remain here, leave immediately, the Pasha [commander] has granted permission.

[...]

A VOLUNTEER: (approaching the colonel) Sir! Sir! We came here with our own will. You show the enemy with one hand, and with the other, you point towards the gate of escape. You judge me by my youth? I think I lived long enough. I come here with my grave shroud wrapped around my neck, and I have the courage to face martyrdom. I came all the way from Baghdad for this purpose. [...]

ANOTHER VOLUNTEER: Which one of us do you think would be vile enough to run away from the enemy before the fight starts?

SIDKI BEY: All right! You all want to die for your motherland like we do. Your endeavor will surely be valued by God. Even if your lives are lost, your names will survive. To a decent human being, it is better to die and leave a good name behind than never dying at all. Keep your hearts strong, and do

not fear death. It will find you one day whether you fear it or not. You cannot escape that which is inevitable. (Addressing Zekiye) Boy! Who are you?

[...]

ZEKIYE: (apprehensive) Adem [=Adam, Man]

SIDKI BEY: What is your name?

ZEKIYE: (pulling herself together) Adem Sir!

SIDKI BEY: (to himself) All this, such an unfortunate dream. (addressing Zekiye) You are free to leave the castle.

ZEKIYE: Isn't there permission to stay in the castle?

SIDKI BEY: My child. What good will you do here, that I might keep you?

ZEKIYE: I will die for the motherland. What other kind of service would you require?

SIDKI BEY: But you can't even use a gun.

ZEKIYE: I am offering you my life. And you tell me that I am young. I ask you, are you here to kill or to die? If you came here to kill, then kill me. If you are here to die, you can be sure that I will die a more eager and peaceful death than you will ... What else do you want from me? Is not the motherland a [welcoming] dervish lodge? Does it matter whether the self-sacrificing dervish is portly or frail? Please be as good to let your children die for their country. So many young people die of tuberculosis and the plague. What difference does it make if one or two die by bullets or cannonballs?

[...]

SIDKI BEY: (examining Zekiye's face) Boy! (to himself) Those with rosy cheeks wish to die, those with grey beards wish to die. What can I say. May God spare you all. [...]

[From ACT III]

[Islam Bey is wounded in the battle and lying in a bed. He wakes up to the sound of enemy cannons]

[...]

ISLAM BEY: Fire them! Fire them! Wake the sleeping lions. Their faces will be right before you and their claws on your chest. What's this on my body? Ah! I was wounded. [...] Such a pity, all the fights I've won, the swords I've crushed... the squadrons I have decimated... were all a dream. O dear God! ... (The racket of the cannons intensifies) Fire! Fire! Even if you blast the earth with your fire, you will not find one woman, one child in this

castle who is to be scared of that clatter... I was so wrong! I thought only a handful would die for the motherland. It seems that's what the enemy had assumed. Yes! The Ottomans talk as if they have no concern for the motherland, they seem so indifferent, you think they are made of stone. But when you show them the enemy, when they realize that the holy soil of the motherland is to be trampled under the filthy feet of the foreigners, then something happens to these people. At that time, the differences between me and the laziest peasant are dissolved. At that time, those wretched Turks wrapped in coarse wool and felt, those gentle, kind faced peasants, the desperate people whom we do not tend to tell apart from the harnessed oxen, disappear completely. In their place appears the spirit of Ottomanness, and the spirit of heroism. Even the weakest of them grabs a sword with his teeth, bullets in his hand. In defending a single stone of the frontier, no one [among these peasants], even the most insignificant one, is less valiant than a lion protecting her cubs.

[...]

[from ACT I]

[Colonel Sıdkı Bey, İslam Bey, Zekiye and soldiers in the castle, following the Ottoman victory]

[...]

SIDKI BEY: Brave lions! ... The enemy has fled, and we are not in a hurry. Stop and listen to your colonel for a while.... You have regarded this division more precious than your own lives. Each one of you stood up to ten men. Within ninety days, you have endured every possible kind of hardship and tribulation. You defended the honour of the Ottoman [nation]. You proved that you are the offspring of your glorious forefathers. Go wherever you please from here. Have no fear, wherever you go, you will be surprised by the respect shown to you, when you say "I was one of the defenders of Silistra." ... Soldiers, we have saved a castle of our Sultan. Many among us reached the level of martyrdom. Come on, let us all cheer together: "Long live the Sultan."

SOLDIERS: (accompanied by the trumpet) Long live the Sultan!

SIDKI BEY: (to the public) Brothers! We have risked our very lives. We fought for the good of the motherland. We will do it again. We will do it any time. Aren't we Ottomans? The reputation of the Ottomans is that they die for even the smallest benefit of the motherland. We too, are always ready to die for this cause. Long live the motherland! Long live the Ottomans!

ISLAM BEY: Come on, or did you lose your voices? Shout! Long live the motherland! Long live the Ottomans!

(All together) Long live the motherland! Long live the Ottomans!

(Curtains are drawn)

The end

Translated by Ahmet Ersoy

MEHMED AKİF: HYMN TO INDEPENDENCE

Title: *İstiklal Marşı* (Hymn to Independence)

Originally published: Ankara, simultaneously published in the daily *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* and the journal *Sebilürreşad* (March 2, 1921)

Language: Ottoman Turkish

The original prints of the poem are republished in Zeki Sarıhan, *Vatan Türküsi: İstiklal Marşı, Tarihi ve Anlamı* (Ankara, Ministry of Culture, 2000), pp. 34–35.

About the author

Mehmed Akif (Ersoy) [1873, Istanbul – 1936, Istanbul]: poet and national activist. Mehmed Akif was the son of a *medrese* (Islamic school) teacher of Albanian origin. After receiving his primary Islamic training in a local school, he studied in secular institutions, mastering Arabic, Persian and also French. Although trained as a veterinarian surgeon, he was employed as a professor of literature at the Istanbul Academy of Sciences after 1908. He is known as the most eminent figure of the Islamic reform movement of the second constitutional period (1908–1913). In contrast to the resolute traditionalist stance of some conservatives, a large group of intellectuals like Mehmed Akif believed in the essential compatibility of Islam and modernization, promoting, under the constitutional regime, the idea of a social and cultural regeneration based on Islamic principles. After the Balkan Wars of 1912–13, Mehmed Akif joined the Committee of Union and Progress, the political party that was in charge of the Ottoman government following the constitutional revolution of 1908. At this time, he was renowned as a fervent preacher of “the Unity of Islam” (*İslam İttihadı*), the policy espoused by the Unionists in order to gain the allegiance of the Arab citizens. During the First World War, Mehmed Akif worked in the intelligence service of the Committee of Union and Progress, propagating the pan-Islamic message in Germany (among British prisoners of war from the Muslim colonies) and the Arabian peninsula. Following the invasion of İzmir (*Gr. Smyrna*) by the Greek forces, he began preaching in support of the nascent independence movement, while writing passionate anti-imperialist articles in the Islamist journal *Sebilürreşad* (Path of Righteousness). After the British invasion of Istanbul (1920), he was invited to Ankara by Mustafa Kemal, who was eager to gain public support by appealing to Muslim dignitaries. In Ankara, Mehmed Akif got elected to the national parliament that was convened in April 1920. In the fol-

lowing months, he was sent to various towns in Anatolia, campaigning for the independence movement. With his immense popularity among conservative circles as the “poet of Islam,” Mehmed Akif was able to mobilize large Anatolian masses for the cause of national independence. Yet, on the eve of the final Turkish victory, he severed his ties with Ankara, disillusioned by the political agenda of Mustafa Kemal. When the Republic was declared in 1923, Mehmed Akif left Turkey for Egypt, returning to Istanbul only for the summers. When the principle of secularism was accepted by the parliament in 1927, he made his self-imposed exile permanent, only returning to Turkey in 1936, wishing to die in his own country. Republican official historiography portrays Mehmed Akif as a great national poet and as a hero of the war of independence, carefully overlooking his post-Republican absence. His broader intellectual legacy is embraced by the conservatives who lay emphasis on his critical stance towards Republican secularism.

Main works: *Safahat* [Stages] (1911); *Süleymaniye Kürsüsünde* [On the Pulpit of the Süleymaniye Mosque] (1912); *Hakkın Sesleri* [Voices of Truth] (1914); *Hatıralar* [Memoirs] (1917); *Âsım* (1924); *Gölgeler* [Shadows] (1933).

Context

In October 1920, only months after the inauguration of the national parliament in Ankara, local newspapers announced the guidelines of a poetry competition organized by the newly established Ministry of Education. The objective of the competition was to select a poem, defined from the start as the “Hymn to Independence,” that would best represent the aims of the national resistance movement and appeal to the public as a token of their national struggle. When none of the 724 works submitted to the contest were found worthy of adoption by the national parliament, Mehmed Akif (who had declined to join the contest because of the cash prize involved) was invited directly by the minister of education to submit a separate entry. In the early months of 1921, Akif’s poem was sanctioned by the parliament as the official “Independence Hymn” of the Turkish nation. Subsequently, another competition was launched for the musical composition of the piece. The whole endeavor was part of an active propaganda and mobilization campaign conducted by the leadership of the resistance movement, which also involved activities such as the acquisition and control of provincial newspapers, or the careful dispersal of acclaimed orators around Anatolia. Throughout the War of Independence, the Hymn was recited (or sung) on every public occasion organized by the resistance. An intensely emotional poem written by the most revered literary figure of the time, the ‘Hymn’ was a powerful instrument for augmenting nationalist sentiments among the Anatolian public. Conceived in the form of a national anthem, Akif’s poem also worked as an important to-

ken of legitimacy for the Ankara government yet in need of local and international recognition.

Mehmed Akif's poem, imbued with images of Islamic martyrdom, powerfully conveys the emotions and anxieties of a people fearful of losing its independence, and even its existence, in the face of imperialist violence. Still, in contrast to Akif's other military paeans, the strong Islamic evocations of the 'Hymn' are outweighed by an overall emphasis on national pride and solidarity. The fact that the Islamist poet never makes any specific reference to the 'Turkishness' of the nation has often led to interpretations that it was a pan-Islamic kind of nationalism, rather than Turkish, that Akif envisaged as the moving ideology behind the Anatolian resistance. Indeed, appealing exclusively to ethnic Turks would have been contrary to Mehmed Akif's conviction that all Islamic peoples in the world constituted a greater "nation" unified by their faith. With reference to a *hadith* (prophetic saying) that denounced "tribalism" (*kavmiyyet*), Akif was strongly opposed to a politics of identity based exclusively on ethnicity, as fostered by the pan-Turkist wing of Turkish nationalism. Nevertheless, in Akif's mind, Turkey was a separate and privileged political entity that constituted Islam's most prominent bastion of resistance against imperialism. A closer reading of his Hymn reveals the strong territorial, if not ethnic, overtones of Akif's religiously-clad nationalism. Even a cursory glance into the 'Hymn' leaves no doubt that the poet's intended audience was the Turkish people, distinguished in the poem as a collectivity that nurtured the national ideal of independence, and one that had lived free "since time immemorial." The consistent use of the word '*yurt*' (motherland), an ancient Turkish word recently popularized by the nationalists in place of the Arabic term '*vatan*' (favored by the Ottomanists), is also redolent of the local patriotism embedded in Mehmed Akif's lines. Still, due to the ambiguous stance that the poet maintained between his larger pan-Islamic and Turkish nationalist loyalties, many critical terms in the poem, such as '*millet*' (nation) or '*ırk*' (race, descent), extended across various shades of meaning. As such, Akif's 'Hymn' suited the yet unresolved political agendas of the independence movement, within which religion played a major role as a mobilizing agent.

The poem's aggressive tone is largely determined by the strong anti-imperialist sentiments prevalent among members of the resistance movement. In fact, some parts of the 'Hymn' can even be considered aggressively anti-Western, in striking contrast to the resolute westernizing agenda of the future Republic. Mehmed Akif considered western civilization to be in an alarming state of moral decay. For him, it was essential for the Islamic world to resist the degenerate values propagated by the modern West (although, one was expected

to appropriate certain elements of Western material progress), and to fight against the imperialist system of global exploitation. Hence, in the ‘Hymn,’ Western civilization, as the imperialist aggressor, is characterized as a terrifying “monster” lurking beneath steel-clad walls, but a depraved one at that, with a single tooth left in its mouth. The very fact that the text begins with the call “Fear not!” is significant in terms of expressing the feelings of terror, humiliation and revolt that must have dominated the Turkish public mood around 1921. By this time, in accordance with the Sèvres Treaty of 1919, most of what had been left of the Ottoman Empire was under Allied occupation, including symbolic locations such as Istanbul, İzmir and Bursa. The rest of Anatolia remained fatally depopulated and impoverished, while the Ottoman army was severely depleted by numerous defeats and mass desertions. The resistance movement in Ankara had gained no significant victories until this point, and was merely trying to gather local resistance groups under its own leadership for the organization of a regular army. To that end, Kemalist leadership was ready to utilize all available ideological weaponry, including the kind of religious sentiment that Mehmed Akif so powerfully articulated. The fact that the poem remained the national anthem after the promulgation of the Republic, during its secularization, and throughout the subsequent political upheavals, reflects its very power in embodying the constellation of feelings that went into the making of the national War of Independence.

The Hymn to Independence

“Fear not!” The crimson flag gleaming above these horizons will never fade,
Not until the last hearth of the motherland fades out.
That flag is the star of my nation, shining forever,
It is mine, it belongs solely to my nation.

Coy crescent, I beg you, do not knit your brow,
Smile for once upon my heroic race, why that anger, that rage.
Or else, you will not be blessed, for all that blood we spilled in your name,
For independence is the prerogative of my God-loving nation.

I live free. I lived free since time immemorial,
What mad man, I wonder, hopes to put me in chains.
Like a roaring flood, I engulf the banks, erupt,
I tear apart mountains, outspread the horizons, overflow.

If the western horizons are dimmed by a steel-clad wall,
Standing firm are my frontiers, like a chest bursting with zeal.
It might howl, do not fear. How can it devour such faith?
That monster called civilization, left with a single tooth.

Friend! Do not let any villain set foot on my homeland,
Shield it with your own body, stop this shameless assault.
The days will come. Days promised to you by God,
Perhaps tomorrow, perhaps even sooner than that.

Do recognize what you stand upon. Just earth?
Think. With thousands of shroudless martyrs lying beneath?
You are the son of a martyr, do not fail your ancestor,
Never surrender this paradise land, even when offered the whole world.

Who would not die for this heavenly land?
Martyrs would gush out, if you squeezed the soil.
God can take whatever I have; my heart, my beloved,
But only, I hope, not deprive me of my motherland.

God! This is the only plea of my soul,
Let no impure hand touch a stone of my sanctuary.
These calls to prayer, confirming the basis of my faith,
Should resound forever in the motherland's skies.

Then, in ecstasy, my tombstone – if I'd have one – would prostrate a thousand times,
Every slash in my body weeping bloody tears,
My carcass would burst out of the soil, like an ethereal soul,
I would be so elated, my head touching the heavens above.

Gleam, O crescent, gleam like the twilight,
Bless all the blood that we spilled,
Neither you, nor my race shall ever perish,
For freedom is the prerogative of my flag, forever free,
And independence is the prerogative of my God-loving nation.

Translated by Ahmet Ersoy

This is the second in a series of four volumes, presenting the most important texts that triggered and shaped the processes of nation-building in Central and Southeast Europe. The series aims to integrate the history of these cultures with that of general European civilization. Thus it counteracts the habit whereby European intellectual phenomena and historical movements are generally analyzed where they originated and experienced their earliest and most intensive development, while the peculiar manifestations of these currents in the 'Other Europe' are neglected.

The present collection focuses on the interplay of Romantic cultural discourses and the shaping of national ideology throughout the nineteenth century, tracing the patterns of cultural transfer with Western Europe as well as the mimetic competition of national ideologies within the region. 67 texts, including hymns, manifestos, articles or extracts from lengthy studies exemplify the impact of 'National Romanticism' on the cultural space ranging from Poland to the Ottoman Empire. Each excerpt is accompanied by a presentation of the author, and by an analysis of the context in which the respective work was born.

ALREADY PUBLISHED:

Vol. I. Late-Enlightenment – Emergence of the Modern 'National Idea'
FORTHCOMING:

Vol. III. Modernism – Creating National States

Vol. IV. Anti-Modernism – Radical Revisions of Collective Identity

"This 'Identity Reader' offers an indispensable contribution to our understanding of the complexities and varieties of collective identities in Eastern Europe over the course of the last three centuries. These authors and excerpts, many of them translated into English for the first time, many of them little known even in the academic world, offer an illuminating set of perspectives on the emergence and evolution of national identities in the region. Particularly illuminating is the brilliant juxtaposition of texts and contexts from the many lands and communities that constitute the region as a whole. These volumes will be indispensable for all scholars and students of the history, literature, and politics of Eastern Europe."

Larry Wolff

Professor of History, New York University

Central European University Press

Budapest – New York

Sales and information:

ceupress@ceu.hu

Website: <http://www.ceupress.com>

ISBN 978-963-7326-60-8

